Bible Versions

To Test the True Character of Your Bible

Bible Versions

To Test the True Character of Your Bible

By

Eldred Thomas, B.A., THM

President-Research Educational Foundation, Inc.

Published by

Research Educational Foundation, Inc.

11061 Shady Trail

Dallas, Texas 75229

In accord with the United States Code, 1988 Edition, Volume Seven, Title 17-Copyrights:

"Copyright does not preclude others from using the ideas or information revealed by the author's work. Copyright in a new version covers only the material added by the later author and has no effect one way or the other on the copyright or public domain status of the preexisting material." - "A work might be 'lawful' under the doctrine of fair use."

Fair use as defined by Section 107 of Title 17 is defined as:

"purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research."

In determining fair use "the factors to be considered shall include - whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for non-profit educational purposes."

Under the above guidelines of the United States Code, I, therefore, give permission to anyone to use any part of this book for the above uses and to translate into any language that might be useful.

At the age of 15, I was given a copy of the American Standard Version Bible by my home pastor who had just graduated from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, in Louisville, Kentucky. Even though this Bible was recommended highly by my pastor, I could not seem to use it in my Bible studies as a young minister.

As years passed, others gave me copies of other versions of the Bible which met with the same reaction in my spirit. The Holy Spirit would never let me change from my King James Bible.

In looking at these other versions, I ran across such expressions as: "some ancient manuscripts," "oldest and best manuscripts," "two most reliable early manuscripts," these, and other similar expressions found in the margins and footnotes. This was confusing to me.

I finally decided about twenty years ago to make a thorough study to find out just which version was the best. This took me a lot of material which resulted in the following manuscript.

I trust that the reader will be blessed by this information confirming the Holy Spirit's choice of the Bible that I have used all my life.

God bless you.

THE AUTHOR

FOREWORD

God's Holy Word was written by God himself. "'... holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.'" (2 Peter 1:21) The Old Testament was written in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek.

From these original autographs, many true copies were made. God's people used these faithful copies for many centuries to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ.

It was not until 1881 that the original Text of the New Testament was replaced with one that was based upon a few bad manuscripts from Alexandria, Egypt. Almost all modern Bibles are translated from this bad Greek Text. This Greek Text accounts for many deletions found in most modern Bibles.

This is what this book is all about.

W. A. CRISWELL, PASTOR
FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201

November 6, 1980

Mr. and Mrs. Eldred Thomas
5505 Northaven
Dallas, Texas 75229

Dear precious couple, Eldred and Raye Nell Thomas:

Just now there was placed on my desk this intriguing and unusual little book entitled, "Bible Versions." The fact that it was written by you makes it a thousand times welcome in my hands. The fact that it is a defense of the King James Version of the Holy Scriptures and that it has the courage to challenge some of the supposedly assured results of textual criticisms, makes the volume ten thousand times acceptable to me. When you say that the King James Version still stands as the best Bible in all times, I say, "Amen and praise the Lord!"

We love you more with each passing day. Keep on praying for us and remembering us.

Devotedly and faithfully, your friend and pastor,

W. A. Criswell

WAC:ep

CONTENTS

A Student's Perspective v

To Test the True Character of Your Bible ix

Chapter I

The Word of God Came From God Himself 1

Chapter II
Different Kinds of Bibles 4

Chapter III
Existing Manuscripts 7

Chapter IV
Bible Versions 9

Chapter V
Bible Versions Examined 15

Chapter VI
Historical & Philosophical Background 27

Chapter VII
Philosophy & Textual Criticism 33

Chapter VIII
Wescott & Hort's Theories Examined 36

Chapter IX
The Thesis of the Traditional Text 42

Chapter X
John William Burgon's Intriguing Discovery of 1881 . 45

Summary 82

Bibliography 85

A Student's Perspective

Satan has tried to destroy the truth of God's Word since the time of Adam and Eve. (Genesis 3:1- "Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field... And he said unto the woman, 'Yea, hath God said Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?'") Satan disobeyed God and he was thrown out of heaven for his rebellion. He has tried to get man to turn against God because God punished Satan. Satan has always wanted man to believe his lies. He used man to try to change the truth of the Word of God.

There are reasons why man should not change the Word of God. The Bible tells us, the men who wrote the Scriptures wrote only what the Holy Spirit told them to write. Man's salvation is dependent on God's Holy Word. God knew there would be those who would try to change His Word. God forbids man from adding or taking away from His Word. The Bible in Revelation 22:18-19 lists the punishments for changing His Word.

There were three cities where the three different Bibles came from since the changing of the original Text began. Antioch was the city where the Apostles wrote the Evangelical Bible. These men were the ones who received the Revelation from The Holy Spirit to write the New Testament,(Evangelical Text). The Apostles then passed the **completed** Text on to their students. The students guarded and studied the Text. Rome was the city where the Catholics changed the original Text. They named their Bible the Catholic Bible which became the Bible of Rome. Alexandria was the center of Philosophy. A man named Origen changed the original Text and called his

Bible the Hexapla. This man believed that Jesus was just a man and the Bible was not Divinely inspired.

It is important to know which Bibles are copied from the good texts and which ones are copied from the bad texts. The Bibles that were copied from the good Texts have not changed the truth of God's Word. The Bibles that were copied from the bad Texts have changed the truth of God's Word. These bad copies of the old Greek Text should not be put in any Bible because they have changed the Word of God.

There were two men in 1881, named Westcott and Hort, who secretly tried to change God's Word by writing their own text to use for the Bible. They used a bad manuscript to write their own text. The bad manuscript that they used was called the Vaticanus. The Vaticanus was a bad manuscript because it left out, changed, and added many verses and words that were in the Evangelical Text of the Apostles. Many centuries ago, the men rejected the Vaticanus because it was incorrect.

Westcott and Hort believed that man had the right to decide which verses and words should be in the Bible. Westcott and Hort themselves did not believe that every word in the Bible was given by God.

Westcott and Hort's bad Greek Text was used to make the Revised Version of 1881, and almost all the Modern English Bibles. John William Burgon, one of the greatest textual critics, was the first to discover what Westcott and Hort had secretly done in 1881. The Bibles based on the bad versions should not even exist. These Bibles do not contain all of the Evangelical Text's scriptures in them. There are more than 3,000 changes. These Bibles do not contain the **whole** truth of God's

Word. Bible-believing Christians should know the whole truth of God's Word.

The only way for Christians to know the whole truth of God's Word is by using the Bibles which have been written from the texts that were copied from the original manuscripts. These texts did not add to or take away from the original Hebrew and Greek scriptures. The Sacred Scriptures were kept by the Scribes of Israel. We have them today in the form of the Old Testament called the Massoretic Text. The Old Testament prepared the way for the coming of Jesus to bring redemption to all mankind. The scriptures that are now preparing the world for the second coming of Jesus is the New Testament. The New Testament was written during the first century. The Holy Spirit Divinely inspired the Apostles to write the New Testament. The Apostle John guarded the New Testament until he died around 100 A.D. The Text that contains the original scriptures of the New Testament is the Evangelical Text.

A Godly man named Erasmus was the man who placed the Evangelical Text in print in 1516. God divinely chose Erasmus to make a printed text of the Scriptures so we can know the truth of God's Word. There is one English translation that used the Massoretic Text for the Old Testament **and** the Evangelical Text for the New Testament. This translation is the Authorized King James Version of 1611. The 47 men in England who translated the King James Version all believed that the Scriptures were given by the Divine inspiration of God. The English of the King James Version is the only translation that has preserved the **correct meaning** of the original Greek and Hebrew Texts. The King James Version of 1611 is the

only Bible that contains **all** of the original scriptures of the Hebrew and Greek Texts for the Old and New Testaments. The **whole** truth of God's Word is found in the King James Bible.

God's Word is complete and eternal. Many Godly men of the past have died to protect the Word of God from those who want to destroy the truth of God's Word. There is no reason why anyone should not want to know the **whole** truth of the Word of God. The King James Version provides the **complete** and **eternal** truth of God's Word. The Holy Spirit will lead the way to understanding the truth of the Word of God.

Dina L. Solomon
18 year old freshmen at
University of Dallas
Dallas, Texas
Spring 1992

To Test The True Character Of Your Bible

YOU MIGHT ASK THE QUESTION: "How can I know if my Bible is a good version or not?" There are many tests, but let me give you just one: I Timothy 3:16. What does your Bible say? If your Bible says: "God was manifest in the flesh," then probably you have a good Bible. If it does not, your Bible is based on false and corrupt manuscripts. The Lord God in Heaven does not want His word to be changed in any manner, shape or form. Satan hates the fact that God was manifested in the flesh. He has tried to take this out of the Bible. God bless you as you hide the word in your heart.

In John 5:2 there is another test that you might like to make. It is the little word "Bethesda." If your Bible has spelled it differently, for example, "Bethsaida" or "Bethsatha," either in the text or in the margin, or as a footnote; you can know that your Bible is translated from corrupted manuscripts. (Please note: I am referring to the pool in John 5:2 and not the cities referred to in other passages, which are spelled correctly.) Joachin Jeremias in "Rediscovery of Bethesda" states that a copper scroll found in Qumram Cave III, dating from 35 to 65 A.D. shows the correct spelling which was "Bethesda." The evangelical text is the text of the apostles. God bless.

Eldred Thomas

The Word of God came from God Himself

chapter 1

Chapter I

GOD wrote it

II Peter 1:21 - "*For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*"

II Timothy 3:16 - "*All scripture is given by inspiration of God....*"

GOD preserved it

Isaiah 40:8 - "*The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.*"

I Peter 1:23 - "*..Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.*"

Matthew 5:18 - "*For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass , one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*"

Mark 13:31 - "*Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.*"

Our Salvation is dependent upon HIS Word

Romans 10:13, 14, 17 - "*For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him in whom they have not heard?...So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God.*"

GOD has cautioned us not to add to or take away from HIS Word

Deuteronomy 4:2 - "*Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it....*"

Revelation 22:18-19 - "*For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plaques that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.*"

GOD warned through the Apostle Paul that some would corrupt The Word of GOD

II Corinthians 2:17 - "*For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God....*"

II Peter 3:15-16 - "*...as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you...which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.*"

Different Kinds of Bibles

chapter 2

Chapter II

There have been always, since corruptions of the text began, three distinct kinds of Bibles:

THE EVANGELICAL
THE CATHOLIC
THE CRITICAL, (philosophical)

There were three capitals of ancient Christianity:

ANTIOCH
ROME
ALEXANDRIA

The Evangelical Bible was written in Jerusalem and Asia Minor and was the Bible of Antioch.

The Catholic Bible was translated from Greek to Latin and was the Bible of Rome.

The Critical or Philosophical Bible was made in the great center of philosophy, Alexandria.

Upon the death of the Apostle John around 100 A.D., both Alexandria and Rome tried to capture the attention of Christians with their Bibles. The Roman Catholic Church succeeded in getting their members to accept their Bibles, but Alexandria did not get wide acceptance.

After 1900 years, we still have basically three Bibles:

THE EVANGELICAL
THE CATHOLIC
THE CRITICAL

The Evangelical Bible is now in print in the English: King James Version; in Spanish: the Old Valera; in German: Martin Luther's Bible, and in many other languages the same text, upon which the King James was based, has been used.

The Catholic Bible for many years was the Latin Vulgate, which was revised by Jerome in 382 A.D. The Douay Version, which still exists, was translated into English in the 16th Century. The Catholic Bible contains Apocryphal books which the Evangelicals have rejected as spurious. The NAB is the New Catholic Bible.

The Critical or Philosophical Bible today is based upon the **Westcott and Hort** Greek Text from which come our many modern translations. Westcott and Hort based their Greek text on a small group of Alexandrian manuscripts (less than 1%) which were very corrupt, containing over 7,000 deletions, changes, and additions.

J. Harold Greenlee in his "Introduction to New Testament Criticism" states that: "The Text of Westcott and Hort is a 'B' text." The Manuscript "B" is the Vaticanus Manuscript (4th Century) which was consigned to oblivion centuries ago in the archives of the Vatican Library and was rediscovered in 1481.

This manuscript, the Vaticanus or "B" Manuscript:

1. Omits the last part of Mark's gospel - 16:17-20
2. Omits 2,877 words
3. Adds 536 words
4. Substitutes 935 words
5. Transposes 2,098 words
6. Modifies 1,132 words.

In all, there are 7,578 divergences.

Existing Manuscripts

chapter 3

CHAPTER III

Let us take a look at the existing manuscripts of the Sacred Scriptures:

The Old Testament scriptures were jealously guarded by the Massoretic scribes who were given the task of copying the scriptures without error. This text of the Authorized Version of 1611 was a Hebrew Text that was true to the original.

The New Testament Manuscripts fall into the following categories:

Papyri 2nd to 4th Centuries	86
Uncials 4th to 10th Centuries	269
(Parchments with capital letters)	
Minuscules 9th to 16th Centuries	2795
(Written in cursive script)	
Lectionaries 4th Century onward	2205
Total	5355 plus.

All of the above **Existing Manuscripts** witness to the **Evangelical Text** of the Bible with the following few exceptions:

Witnesses to the **Catholic** Bible - approximately 6, including D1, D2, (05, 06) plus a few old Latin versions, a few fathers and a few Cursives.

Witnesses to the **Critical** Bible - Approximately 9 (B,C,D, Aleph ℵ L.T.Z. 33)

Bible Versions

chapter 4

CHAPTER IV

The Revised Version of 1881 was the first **attempted** English revision of the Bible since the Authorized or King James Version of 1611. The incorrectly called Revised Version of 1881 was based on Westcott and Hort's Greek Text based on the corrupted manuscript, the "Vaticanus" or "B". This Greek Text, like the "B" manuscript it was based on, had more than 7,000 changes. Unfortunately, ALL MODERN VERSIONS are based on this Greek Text, as of December 1978.

The Critical Bible is composed of these modern versions. Most Christians who accept the Critical Bible do not know **its** origin or background.

The Catholic Bible has been known at different periods as the "Vulgate," the "Douay-Rheims," and at the present the "New American Bible." In the foreword of the "NAB," a statement is made which could have very important connotations to "Evangelicals." The statement is: "In general, Nestle-Aland's New Testament Greek was followed." Both Nestle and Aland follow the corrupt Westcott and Hort Greek Text. In 1588, Sir Francis Drake under Queen Elizabeth defeated the Spanish Armada, supported by the Pope, which was an attempt to make England Catholic and to force England to accept the Bible of the Jesuits, the Douay-Rheims.

From time to time, the Douay-Rheims has been revised. With the advent of the Westcott and Hort Greek Text and the succeeding modern versions based on this text, the Catholics have recently released a Bible called the "New American Bible" which used as its text the Nestle-Aland, which is basically a Westcott and Hort Text. This should be of great interest to evangelicals. Now the

Catholic Bible, with the exception of the Apocrypha, is virtually the same as the Protestant Modern Version Bibles. This has happened in spite of the fact that evangelicals have historically refused to accept the Catholic Bible.

It should be noted also that there are those who would like a Bible that would be acceptable by all religions: Mohammedans, Catholics, Protestants, and all the rest. I wonder what kind of Bible this would be?

The Lord wants us to love one another and come to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ as our personal Savior. This can only be done if we adhere strictly to His Holy and Divine Word.

The Evangelical Bible which was guarded over by the Holy Spirit and protected by the blood of the martyrs, has come down to the present day and was used by all the great men of faith that God chose to use, such as Martin Luther, John Calvin, Zwingli, John Knox, Whitfield, John Wesley, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, Charles Finney, Dwight L. Moody, and Billy Sunday.

This text was carried by missionaries from Antioch into Southern France, then to England and Scotland, then to Northern Europe and Northern Italy. The Evangelical Text was first placed in print in 1516, providentially, just one year before the Reformation was ignited by Martin Luther by the posting of his 95 Thesis on the door of the church in Wittenburg, Germany. Luther used this text the following year to translate the Bible into German. Calvin and Zwingli also used it, and later it became the basis for the King James Version in 1611.

The King James Version

Never before or since has there been such an aggregate of scholarship and spirituality that existed when 47 learned men came together to translate the King James Version. Out of the 47, 4 were college presidents, 6 were bishops, 5 were deans, 30 had doctor's degrees, 39 had master's degrees, 41 were university professors who were all Greek and Hebrew students, 13 were highly skilled Hebrew scholars of a type that rarely has existed since, 10 were Greek scholars of rare scholarship, 3 were Eastern linguists that were as much home with Arabic and the Eastern languages as their own English. A literal dynamo of spiritual power, all of them believed in the plenary verbal inspiration of the Bible, the divinity of Christ without equivocation, and all of them were men of prayer. Some prayed as much as 5 hours per day during the entire course of their Christian lives. Only God could have prepared this group of men for such a monumental task, the results of which were, in the providence of God, needed for the great evangelistic and missionary thrust of the succeeding centuries.

These men were divided into six companies and each assigned a portion of scripture to translate. Each man translated each portion, then met to compare results. The results were transmitted to each of the other companies for review and consent. A select committee then went over the whole work, and finally a committee of two of the best linguistics were assigned the task of final review and approval. The results were the best Bible the world has ever possessed which has been used more than any other Bible to bring the world to Christ. It still stands

as a masterpiece of scholarship and literary art unexcelled in the history of the world.

The English of the King James was the resultant of the translators' skill of preserving the style and accurate meaning of the Greek and Hebrew texts; and was not, as some think today, strictly 17th century English.

Thee, thou, and thine must be retained in the English Bible because there is **no other way to express** second person singular. When the plural form is used, it is violating the true meaning of the original Greek.

KJV English Pronouns

	Singular	Plural
1st Person	I	We
2nd Person	Thou/Thee/Thy Thine	Ye/You/Your
3rd Person	He/She/It	They

The archaic English pronouns of the KJV distinguish number in the second person pronoun in all cases, as shown in the table. Thus KJV can certainly render an important service in easily distinguishing between "you singular" and "you plural."

A wonderful tribute to the integrity of the Renaissance English Bible (The King James Authorized Version of 1611) tradition was recently offered in an unlikely publication. *The Bible Translator 39* (April, 1988):230-237, published by the United Bible Societies, featured an essay by a UBS Translation Consultant, based

in Ethiopia, Dr. Ammanuel Mikre-Sellassie, highlights the difficulty in conveying the distinction found in the original Hebrew and Greek texts, between the second person singular and plural. He highlights the fact that modern English no longer has the requisite categories for conveying this important linguistic point. Only Tyndalian, Biblical English accurately conveys the precision of the original Biblical languages on this point:

Translators, and especially those in common language projects, may find it strange and surprising to hear a consultant recommending *Use of the King James Version* for translation.

Bible Versions Examined

chapter 5

CHAPTER V

Bible believing Christians should know which are the good versions and which are the bad.

John William Burgon, one of the great textual critics, ranking with Tregelles and Schrivener, and a great contemporary with Tischendorf, states that: "Codex 'B' (the Vaticanus), Aleph (the Sinaiticus ℵ), and Codex 'Beza' are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant (in existence) and that they exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with; and that they have become (by whatsoever process, for their history is wholly unknown) the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversion of truth, which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of God." These are strong statements, but the facts are numerous and indisputable. The Critical Text is a bad text.

We will now proceed to make a list of the Greek Texts in print that are based on these corrupt manuscripts. They are (as of 1978):

Griesbach	1774-1806
Lachman	1842-50
Tischendorf	1865-72
Tregelles	1857-79
Alford	1960
Westcott and Hort	1881
Von Soden	1913
Nestles	1898
Souter	1947
Merk	1957

Bover	1953
Vogel	1955
BFBS	1958

We will also list the existing versions that are based on these corrupt Greek Texts. They are:

American Standard Version
Amplified New Testament
Berkely Version of the N.T.
Confraternity N.T.
Darby's New Testament
Diaglot New Testament
Godbey's New Testament
Good News For Modern Man
Goodspeed's New Testament
Living Bible (Paraphrased)
Living Bible
Latin New Testament
Montgomery's New Testament
Moffatt's New Testament
New American Standard
New American Version
New English New Testament
New International Version
New World Translation
Parallel Column N.T.
Phillip's New Testament
Panin's Numeric N.T.
Revised Standard Version
Revised Version of 1881
Riverside New Testament
Twentieth Century N.T.

Tischendorf's N.T.
Williams New Testament
Weymouth's New Testament
Wuest's Expanded N.T.

If your version is not listed above and it is not a King James Version, judge it by 1 Timothy 3:16. If it does not state: "God manifest in the flesh," you can know that it comes from corrupt texts.

Caution should be taken, however, that these corrupt versions do not change just one scripture in the future (as Living Bible in I Samuel 20:30, which changed the reading in 1978, from the reading in 1971). It would be best to check more than one passage if you happen to read this book after the year 1979.

We will list for the reader the good Greek texts that are based on the good manuscripts. They are:

Erasmus	1516-22
Stephanus	1550
Beza	1565-04
Elzevir	1624-78
Englishmen's Greek N.T.	1958-74

[Berry's Interlinear]

Berry's Greek Text is published by Zondervan and may be purchased in most seminary book stores or from Zondervan Publishing House, 1415 Lake Drive, S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506.

The Bible for the Christian today who speaks English is the King James of 1611. I recommend that no one desert the Authorized King James which God has blessed through the centuries and used mightily to win souls. It is a pillar and rock of truth. It is the Word of

God. The Holy Spirit anoints this Version and will bless it to your heart.

Now for the reader who would like to further check some of the "bad" versions, we will list some (not nearly all, but just a few) of the scriptures, as we hurriedly go through the New Testament, which show words, phrases, and sometimes whole sentences left out. The reader will be surprised as you check some of the versions. As we have stated, these are not all of the errors. There are literally thousands (around 5,788) in these corrupt versions. Some of the following deletions will be found in your Bible if it is based on a bad manuscript. In some Bibles based on bad manuscripts, all of the following deletions will be found.

Scripture	**Deletion**
Matthew 1:25	firstborn NIV/NAS
Matthew 6:33	of GOD NIV/NAS
Matthew 8:29	Jesus NIV/NAS
Matthew 9:13	repentance NIV/NAS
Matthew 12:35	of the heart NIV/NAS
Matthew 13:51	Jesus saith unto them NIV/NAS
Matthew 16:3	O *ye* hypocrites NIV/NAS
Matthew 16:20	Jesus NIV/NAS
Matthew 17:21	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
Matthew 18:11	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
Matthew 19:9	Last ten words are out NIV/NAS
Matthew 19:17	God NIV/NAS
Matthew 20:7	and whatsoever is right, *that* shall ye receive NIV/NAS

Matthew 20:16	for many be called, but few chosen NIV/NAS
Matthew 20:22	and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? NIV/NAS
Matthew 23:14	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
Matthew 25:13	wherein the Son of Man cometh NIV/NAS
Matthew 27:35	that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet NIV/NAS
Matthew 28:2	from the door NIV/NAS
Matthew 28:9	And as they went to tell his disciples NIV/NAS
Mark 1:1	the Son of God NIV/NAS
Mark 1:14	of the kingdom NIV/NAS
Mark 2:17	to repentance NIV/NAS
Mark 6:11	Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gommorraha in the day of judgement, than for that city NIV/NAS
Mark 7:16	Whole verse out NIV/NAS
Mark 9:24	Lord NIV/NAS
Mark 9:42	in me NAS
Mark 9:44,46	Both verses are out NIV/NAS
Mark 10:21	take up thy cross, NIV/NAS
Mark 11:10	in the name of the Lord NIV/NAS
Mark 11:26	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
Mark 12:29-30	of all the commandments *is*.....this *is* the first commandment NIV/NAS

Mark 13:14	spoken of by Daniel the prophet, NIV/NAS
Mark 14:68	and the cock crew NIV/NAS
Mark 15:28	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
Mark 16:9-20	All 12 verses are out NIV/NAS
Luke 1:28	blessed *art* thou among women NIV/NAS
Luke 2:33	Joseph is changed to father NIV/NAS
Luke 2:43	Joseph and his mother are changed to his parents NIV/NAS
Luke 4:4	but by every word of God NIV/NAS
Luke 4:8	Get thee behind me Satan NIV/NAS
Luke 4:41	Christ NIV/NAS
Luke 7:31	And the Lord said NIV/NAS
Luke 9:54	even as Elias did? NIV/NAS
Luke 11:29	the prophet NIV/NAS
Luke 22:31	And the Lord said, NIV/NAS
Luke 23:17	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
Luke 23:34	Then Jesus said, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. (Footnote says that this sentence is not in early manuscripts) NIV
Luke 23:38	in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, NIV/NAS
Luke 23:42	Lord NIV/NAS
Luke 24:12	Whole verse is out NAS
Luke 24:40	Whole verse is out NAS
Luke 24:49	Jerusalem NIV/NAS
Luke 24:51	and carried up into heaven NAS

John 1:14	begotten NIV
John 1:18	begotten NIV
John 1:27	preferred before me, NIV/NAS
John 3:13	which is in heaven NIV/NAS
John 3:15	should not perish NIV/NAS
John 3:16	begotten NIV
John 3:18	begotten NIV
John 4:42	the Christ NIV/NAS
John 5:3	waiting for the moving of the water NIV/NAS
John 5:4	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
John 6:47	on me NIV/NAS
John 7:53-8:11	All 12 verses are out NIV/NAS
John 8:16	Father NAS
John 9:35	Son of God is changed to Son of man NIV/NAS
John 11:41	where the dead was laid NIV/NAS
John 16:16	because I go to the Father NIV/NAS
John 17:12	in the world NIV/NAS
John 20:29	Thomas NIV/NAS
Acts 2:30	according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ NIV/NAS
Acts 7:30	of the Lord NIV/NAS
Acts 7:37	him shall ye hear NIV/NAS
Acts 8:37	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
Acts 9:5-6	Most of the verse is out NIV/NAS
Acts 10:6	he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do NIV/NAS
Acts 16:31	Christ NIV/NAS

Acts 17:26	blood NIV/NAS
Acts 20:25	of God NIV/NAS
Acts 20:32	brethren NIV/NAS
Acts 23:9	let us not fight against God NIV/NAS
Acts 24:6,7,8	End of 6 through the beginning of 8 is out NIV/NAS
Acts 24:15	of the dead NIV/NAS
Acts 28:16	the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard: NIV/NAS
Acts 28:29	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
Romans 1:16	of Christ NIV/NAS
Romans 9:28	in righteousness NIV/NAS
Romans 11:6	Most of verse is out NIV/NAS
Romans 13:9	Thou shalt not bear false witness NIV/NAS
Romans 14:6	and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard *it* NIV/NAS
Romans 14:9	both and rose NIV/NAS
Romans 14:21	or is offended, or is made weak NIV/NAS
Romans 15:29	of the gospel NIV/NAS
Romans 16:24	Whole verse is out NIV/NAS
1 Corinthians 1:14	I thank God NIV
1 Corinthians 5:7	for us NIV/NAS
1 Corinthians 6:20	and in your spirit, which are God's NIV/NAS
1 Corinthians 7:39	by the law NIV/NAS

1 Corinthians 10:28	for the earth *is* the Lord's, and the fulness thereof NIV/NAS
1 Corinthians 11:24	Take, eat NIV/NAS
1 Corinthians 11:29	Lord's NAS
1 Corinthians 15:47	the Lord NIV/NAS
1 Corinthians 16:22	Jesus Christ NIV/NAS
1 Corinthians 16:23	Christ NIV/NAS
2 Corinthians 4:6	Jesus NIV/NAS
2 Corinthians 4:10	the Lord NIV/NAS
Galatians 3:1	that ye should not obey the truth NIV/NAS
Galatians 4:7	through Christ NIV/NAS
Galatians 6:15	in Christ Jesus NIV/NAS
Ephesians 3:9	by Jesus Christ NIV/NAS
Ephesians 3:14	of our Lord Jesus Christ, NIV/NAS
Philippians 3:16	let us mind the same thing NIV/NAS
Colossians 1:2	and the Lord Jesus Christ NIV/NAS
Colossians 1:14	through his blood NIV/NAS
1 Thessalonians 1:1	Last 9 words are out NIV/NAS
1 Thessalonians 3:11	Christ NIV/NAS
2 Thessalonians 1:8	Christ NIV/NAS
1 Timothy 3:16	God is changed to He NIV/NAS
1 Timothy 6:5	from such withdraw thyself NIV/NAS
2 Timothy 1:11	of the Gentiles NIV/NAS
2 Timothy 4:22	Jesus Christ NIV/NAS
Titus 1:4	the Lord NIV/NAS
Hebrews 1:3	by himself NIV/NAS
Hebrews 2:7	and didst set him over the works of thy hands NIV

Hebrews 2:11	father is added NAS
Hebrews 7:21	after the order of Melchisedec NIV/NAS
Hebrews 10:30	saith the Lord NIV/NAS
Hebrews 10:34	in heaven NIV/NAS
Hebrews 11:11	was delivered of a child NIV/NAS
James 5:16	faults is changed to sins NIV/NAS
1 Peter 1:22	through the Spirit NIV/NAS
1 Peter 4:1	for us NIV/NAS
1 Peter 4:14	on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified NIV/NAS
1 Peter 5:10	Jesus NIV/NAS
1 Peter 5:11	glory NIV/NAS
2 Peter 2:17	forever NIV/NAS
1 John 1:7	Christ NIV/NAS
1 John 2:7	from the beginning NIV/NAS
1 John 4:3	Christ is come in the flesh NIV/NAS
1 John 4:9	begotten NIV
1 John 4:19	him NIV/NAS
1 John 5:7-8	in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in the earth. NIV/NAS
Jude 25	wise NIV/NAS
Revelation 1:8	the beginning and the ending NIV/NAS
Revelation 1:9	Christ NIV/NAS

Revelation 1:11	I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. NIV/NAS
Revelation 2:13	thy works NIV/NAS
Revelation 5:14	him that liveth for ever and ever NIV/NAS
Revelation 6:1,3,5,7	and see NIV/NAS
Revelation 11:17	and art to come NIV/NAS
Revelation 12:12	inhabiters of the NIV/NAS
Revelation 12:17	Christ NIV/NAS
Revelation 14:5	before the throne of God NIV/NAS
Revelation 16:17	of heaven NIV/NAS
Revelation 20:9	from God NIV/NAS
Revelation 20:12	God is changed to the throne NIV/NAS
Revelation 21:24	of them which are saved NIV/NAS

Historical & Philisophical Background

chapter 6

CHAPTER VI

The following narrative will give a brief background of bad Bible versions as we see Satan working through history and philosophy to destroy God's sacred Word.

Beginning in the Garden of Eden, Satan attacked the truth of the Word of God. This has persisted until the present day. Satan succeeded in corrupting the world. The flood came and brought a destruction that necessitated a new beginning. He tried again, resulting in the confusion of Babel and the beginning of Babylon and false religion. This false system permeated Eastern religions, the philosophical thought of Greece and Rome, and finally the embryo church, after the death of the Apostle John near 100 A.D. Satan has always worked through philosophy and false religions to try to destroy the knowledge of God and His Word.

The prominent people that Satan used from the beginning are known. Before the flood, Cain taught mankind how to murder. After the flood, Noah's unbelieving son, Ham, helped perpetuate the influence of evil. Among the great perverters of truth was Nimrod. Nimrod was a mighty hunter, a powerfully built man who was admired by all the women of the realm. So great was he that the East is filled with traditions of his great prowess and accomplishments. The first kingdom mentioned in the Bible was that of Nimrod.

Not only was Nimrod against the true God, but he was also a priest of devil-worship and of heathenism of the worst kind. Nimrod, the priest-king, finally died and his wife, Queen Semiramis, proclaimed him the Sun God. This adulterous and idolatrous woman gave birth to an illegitimate son called Tammuz and she claimed that he was supernaturally conceived and that he was Nimrod, incarnate. She, being acquainted evidently with Genesis 3:5, claimed also that he was the promised seed, the

"savior." Not only was Tammuz worshipped, but the mother was also worshipped. This corrupt system filled the World.

Numerous monuments of Babylon show the goddess mother Semiramis with her child Tammuz in her arms. When the religion of Babylon was carried to the ends of the earth, mother and child worship was also carried, hence: among the Chinese, the holy mother was called "Shingmoo" or the "holy mother." She is pictured with her child in her arms with rays of light around her head. The ancient Germans worshipped the virgin "Hertha" with child in arms. The Scandinavians called her "Disa" who was also pictured with a child. The Etruscans called her "Nutria," and among the Druids, the "Virgo-Paritura" was worshipped as the "mother of God." In India she was known as Indrani, who was also represented with child in arms.

The Babylonian mother was known as Aphrodite or Ceres to the Greeks; Nana, to the Sumerians; and as Venus or Fortuna in Rome, and her child as Jupiter. In Jeremiah 44:17-19, there was a stern rebuke for worshipping the "queen of heaven" who was Ashtaroth. In Ephesus the great mother was known as Diana. In Egypt, the Babylonian mother was known as Isis and her child as Horus. Even in Mexico the mother and child were worshipped. During the days of the Roman Empire, mother and child worship permeated the Empire. This was before the establishment of the Church of our Lord.

When the Church of the Lord was established, the arch enemy, Satan, had a backlog of pre-arrangements with which to subtly infiltrate the organized Church so as to pollute its message and dilute its power. The Church was soon to accept most of the heathen Babylonish beliefs and practices. This was only the beginning of corruptions. So corrupt did the Church become that persons who

believed differently were condemned as heretics and killed by burning at the stake. It is estimated that millions perished in this manner. One only has to review the history of the Inquisition to be reminded of these horrible "holocausts."

Philosophy

Philosophy had its part in separating man from God. In the East there was Buddha and Confucius, who lived 557-477 B.C. and 551-478 B.C., respectively. In Greece were Thales, Anaxemines, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, who lived during the period from 600 B.C. to 322 B.C. Greek philosophy thriving at Alexandria in Egypt was soon to have its influence in the early church. Gnosticism was a favorite of many of the philosophers. (Gnostics believed there were many "eons" of beings between God and physical matter, including the Logos, Christ and Jesus.)

During the middle ages Scholastic philosophy flourished with an attempt to harmonize "faith" and "reason." Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) used Aristotle's philosophy as a foundation of the Roman Catholic religion of works. The early modern philosophers were rationalistic. They made reason (the thinking mind) the starting point of their systems. Among these were Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz: living during the period from 1594-1716.

The next group believed in thought as simply a series of experiences (mental). They were called empiricists. They denied the existence of innate ideas. They were Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. They lived from 1632-1776. They were followed by Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) who believed that certain knowledge is confined to the realm of experience. They were followed by George F. Hegel (1770-1832) who believed that history is the third

phase of the universal process (Dialectic). The other two being logic converting itself into Nature and returning to itself as Spirit.

Since Hegel, we have had "existentialism" which is the emphasis of each individual's life situation and its possibilities of choices. It was begun in Denmark by Soren Kirekegaard (1813-1855). It was revived after World War 1 by Jaspers (1883-1969) and Heideggar (born 1889) and popularized by Satre (born 1905). In the Theological field, Karl Barth (1886-1968) was the leading existentialist.

From a neutral position of the philosophers, Satan led them a step further into atheism which is a natural consequence. One of the most common forms of atheism is materialism. From 1748 until 1855, La Metrie, Holback, Moleschott, and Vogt published works that expounded their doctrines. La Metrie believed that the soul was non-existent and he ridiculed the natural evidences of God. Holback taught that belief in God leads to priestcraft and persecution and interferes with natural morality. Moleschott taught that thought is produced by phosphorous and Vogt asserted that thought stands in the same relationship to the brain as urine to the kidneys.

During the 19th century, the emphasis shifted from the relation of soul and body to the question of the origin of life. Before Louis Pasteur proved in 1862 that no known form of life could be generated spontaneously, Van Helmont (1577-1644), William Harvey (1578-1657), Descartes, and even Isaac Newton believed in such preposterous so-called scientific explanations such as: "live mice could be generated by placing a dirty shirt in a bowl of wheat germs" or that worms and insects could be "generated from decayed matter." All of the above intellectuals believed similar things. Man has always run amuck by trusting in human rationalism and intellectual

discovery without the aid of almighty God and His God-breathed Word. Darwin's theories are still unproved and all of these attempts of explaining existence without God and His Incarnate Word are soon outdated, outworn, and legends and lies of the past.

The same can be said about Positivism, which believes that there are no spiritual agencies in the universe, no efficient causes, nothing but facts discoverable by the senses, nothing but events which take place according to natural law; Cybernetics, which teaches that man is a machine and that there are no differences between machines and animals. Published in 1948 by Norbert Wiener, professor of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, his well known book on Cybernetics has captured a long segment of unbelieving philosophical naturalists who agree with him that all human striving is in vain and that entropy must win over information and that the universe must end in chaos. After all is said, **nothing times nothing equals nothing (0 x 0 = 0).** Only God's Holy Word can bring man from chaos to light.

Philosophy & Textual Criticism

chapter 7

CHAPTER VII

Against the backdrop of what we have stated in Chapter VI, we should like to trace the current of intellectual curiosity and rationalism which tampered with the text of the Bible which for centuries had been providentially preserved by the methods directed by God and the Holy Spirit. God had promised to protect and preserve His word, and **He did just that.** His promise could never be broken (Isaiah 40:8).

Johann Semler (1725-91) was the first textual critic to suggest that New Testament Manuscripts had been edited. J.J. Griesbach (1745-1812) was a pupil of Semler. In 1771 he wrote that the New Testament abounds in interpolations and additions, purposefully introduced. Greisbach believed that whenever the New Testament manuscripts varied from each other that the accepted and orthodox readings were to be ruled out as spurious (unacceptable). He stated that the most suspicious readings of all were those that encouraged piety. What a diabolical innovation into the sacred sanctity of the Holy Scriptures. The Sacred Sanctity of the Scriptures is not recognized by any textual critic who believes that the scriptures should be handled just like any other secular book and that the text of the Bible is not the verbally inspired word of God, plenary.

Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort all held the same naturalistic views of Textual Criticism. These views can only be held by those who do not believe in the Divine Providential watchcare of the Holy Word. Although these men were scholars of the first rank, they cannot be trusted to handle the Sacred Scriptures because of their attitude toward the scriptures and to the Divine Son of God. They literally threw out ninety-nine percent of the existing manuscripts and resorted to not more than four of the most corrupt.

You might ask immediately, why? It was because they believed that these manuscripts by virtue of the date at which they were copied, being earlier than the majority of the manuscripts, were the nearest to the autographs. This is the naturalistic viewpoint which is held by all scholars who are not believers in the Divinity of Christ and the plenary verbal inspiration of the Holy Word and the Divine preservation of the Text of the Holy Scriptures. This is the same theory that is used in secular criticism; in other words, Shakespeare, Dante, Euripides, Plato, and any old Latin or Greek writer would be treated the same way. It is the opinion of the writer and a host of Bible-believing Christians that the Sacred Texts of the Scriptures should not be handled like a copy of Shakespeare or Dante.

Here is where the naturalistic scholarship parts with the believing scholarship. They are as far apart as light and dark and could never be reconciled. God's Word is a supernatural book, God-breathed and verbally inspired. The "born again Christian" could never accept any other conviction. This cannot be taught to an unbelieving, unregenerate, naturalistic professor because he neither knows God, through the Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, and does not believe the Bible to be any different from any other book. This explains the attitude and theories of Westcott and Hort, two unbelieving scholars who taught in Cambridge and who fabricated a new Greek Text for the Revision Committee of 1881. A Resolution of the Upper House of the Convocation stated: "No person who denied the deity of Christ should work on the revision."

Wescott & Hort's Theories Examined

chapter 8

CHAPTER VIII

We have already stated that most modern versions of the Bible are based on the heretical Greek Text of Westcott and Hort. Heretical because of the corruptions including over 5,788 changes, deletions, and additions. Many of these are of such nature to do severe harm to the New Testament's divinely inspired text. Godly men of past generations have given their life's blood to protect this Sacred Book from the mutilation that it has experienced through the labor of these two men. It is utterly unfathomable to know why we have been duped into acceptance of this preposterous mutilating of the text. Of course, we hasten to say, many do not know just what has happened. There are also those who do not care, and there are those who blindly take the word of the professor in the classroom without research and review.

Conjectural Emendation

This was a phrase invented by Westcott and Hort. With the utmost of intellectual scrutiny and the farthest excess of mental acuity, it is impossible for the believing Christian to assume that "Conjectural Emendation" has any place in Textual Criticism. What is "Conjectural Emendation"? It is nothing short of subjective guesswork that is not practiced in true scholarship nor in true science.

Imagine, subjecting the Sacred Text to pure conjecture. Imagine deciding Eternal Verities on pure assumption.

Hort freely states that "in dealing with this kind of evidence, equally competent critics often arrive at contradictory conclusions as to the same variation." Admitting nothing definitive in any attempted conclusive analysis. Equally preposterous is their interpretive styles of:

Internal Evidence

Hort says there are two different kinds of internal evidence, "intrinsic probability" and "transcriptional probability."

Now listen to this, "intrinsic probability" is the determination to this textual critic as to what most probably the writer would have written. Now imagine, Westcott and Hort, trying to decide just what the Apostle Paul, or John, or James would have written. Men who have asserted that they do not believe in the Divinity of Christ nor the Verbal Plenary Inspiration of Scriptures. Men whose lives, beliefs, and practices, according to their biographers, render them absolutely unqualified to evaluate the Living Word of God. This form of skeptical dissecting of the Word of God is not appropriate for anyone, because of the character of the written Word and God's power to providentially preserve it. This method is purely subjective, inappropriate for a rationalistic human being of any description to engage in.

On the other hand, there is a far better method and that is to patiently collect all the existing evidence such as manuscripts, patristic quotations, versions, and lectionaries and to diligently adjudicate.

Equally absurd is so-called "transcriptional probability." Imagine dealing with the Sacred Texts in such a hypothetical manner of conjecture. There is not room in all the True Textual Criticism for the word "probability." God's Word is not a "probable" hypothesis. God's Word is authoritative, complete, accurate, and eternal.

"Transcriptional probability" is defined as which of two readings would account for the origin of the other or others in successive stages of copying. Now, listen to that. What? Did I hear correctly? You mean , Mr. Hort, that God has given men such powers to decide which verse or

word was divinely inspired and should be included? Can man be given such a preponderant task as this? Again, a subjectual evaluation that pre-assumes the Textual Critic to be on a level of understanding and knowledge with God Himself. Mortal man has no prerogative to deal with the Sacred Manuscripts in such a way. He should not even be tampering with the Word of God. Even in translations, it would be highly recommended that only Spirit filled and believing scholarship have anything to do with such important tasks.

External Evidence

This is a discipline that Westcott and Hort used very sparsely. There is no substitute for comparison and evaluation of the total number of witnesses, numbering over 5,000. Westcott and Hort were so euphoric over their Satan-guided decision to use basically only one manuscript to determine the New Testament text (a conclusion that could not be arrived at in the wildest annals of scholarship, unless deviously influenced by the Enemy,) that they discarded and refused to use over 90% of the existing manuscripts. External Evidence, in any court of law, is absolutely essential for any conclusion that could approach truth. One of the Great Mysteries of the present day is: "How could such inconceivable and inconsistent thinking be pawned off on so many 'unthinking' and seemingly educated students of the Scriptures?" The only answer is that very few have taken the time to look into the facts of what Westcott and Hort have done for the promotion of the "heretical" Greek Text.

Syrian Recensions

Westcott and Hort threw away almost all the evidence for the New Testament text by simply a fabric of their imagination creating an imaginary text called the

Pre-Syrian Text. This text, they say, existed sometime before the Vaticanus and was a fabricated text by someone who had the Eastern Church's blessings and was an official text. This is a deliberate falsification. **THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO HISTORICAL BASIS FOR THIS WHATSOEVER.** Not in history, not in patristic quotations, not in any of the witnesses; absolutely in no place or in any manner is this intimated by anyone but Westcott and Hort and their followers.

The reason for this diabolical fabrication is: if Satan can get men to believe this, he has succeeded in erasing the True Text from the world. But, thank God, Spirit filled believers would never permit this.

The Neutral Text

Westcott and Hort substitute the main body of the manuscripts with a so-called "neutral text," another invention of these intellectual enemies of the Word of God. The so-called "neutral text" are a few manuscripts chosen by Westcott and Hort for the similarity to Origen's Bible, originating in the scholarly intellectual capital of Alexandria where philosophy was paramount and second only to the philosophy of Greece. Origen believed that Christ was a created being and did not believe in the verbal plenary of the inspiration of the Word of God. He had other strange beliefs too numerous to mention that placed him outside the spiritual leadership of such fathers as Polycarp, Iraneous, and John.

Hoskier states in his volume "Codex B and Its Allies" that neither Aleph (ℵ) or B represent any form of neutral text. He states that there are 656 differences in Matthew, 567 in Mark, 791 in Luke, and 1,022 in John, a singular proof that this is not a neutral text.

The Bible believing Christian would be well informed to know that this neutral text is the one that has

thousands of deletions including the last 12 verses in Mark, "God" in 1 Timothy 3:16, Acts 8:37, and a host of others.

From the neutral text, Westcott and Hort relied heavily on the testimony of "B," the Vaticanus, almost to the exclusion of the few others. The neutral text is therefore essentially a "B" text. **Satan succeeded in placing into circulation one of his favorite manuscripts which had been mutilated at his hands so as to make it barely recognizable by the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, the angels, and the holy men of old who were moved upon by the Holy Ghost. Spirit filled believers today have rejected this falsification.**

The Thesis of the Traditional Text

chapter 9

CHAPTER IX

In preparation for the coming of the Son of God to the earth to bring redemption for all mankind, God divinely placed into the hands of His people, Israel, the Sacred Scriptures for safe keeping. They were kept safely, and we have them today in the form of the Old Testament: The Massoretic Text.

In preparation for the second coming of His Son, Jesus Christ, God has placed into the hands of New Testament believers the Sacred Scriptures known as the New Testament, and they have been faithfully preserved by New Testament believers up to the present time. The Traditional Text contains this depository and has been carefully preserved by the Holy Spirit and is the **Evangelical Text.**

The Holy Spirit selected and led the Lord's servant, Erasmus, to edit the first edition of the New Testament in Greek in 1516. Not by accident, but by the providence of God, a printed text of the scriptures was being made available to Luther, Calvin, Knox, Zwingli, and others who needed them to preach the Gospel. The Dark Ages brought about by the ravages of the State church were soon to be enlightened by the Reformation. This same text was used for the great English Bible of Tyndale and the King James in 1611 which was prepared by the Lord to save England and the English-speaking from falling into the hands of ecclesiastical bigotry and for the great missionary thrusts of the succeeding generations even until the present.

There is one English translation that embodies this sacred trust. It is: **The Authorized King James Version of 1611.**

1. God did not permit the believers of the first few centuries to lose the Sacred Text.
2. God did not permit the Reformation to use a corrupt text.
3. God did not give the Reformers a corrupt text.
4. God did not permit John Wesley to have a corrupt text.
5. God did not keep the true copy of His Sacred Text hidden for over 1500 years in the Vatican in Rome.
6. God did not permit the missionary thrust of the 18th and 19th centuries to have a corrupt text.
7. God did not permit the martyrs to spill their blood for a corrupt text.

The seven declarations are not accepted by those who uphold the text upon which the Modern English Versions are based.

John William Burgon's Intriguing Discovery of 1881

chapter 10

Chapter X

In the year 1881, the same year that the Revised Version of 1881 was first placed into print, there appeared in the October edition of the *London Quarterly Review*, Burgon's article exposing a conspiracy. Portions of this article are included in this chapter for the reader who would like to go deeper into the study of this subject.

John William Burgon was born August 21, 1813. He matriculated at Oxford in 1841, taking several high honors there, and his B.A. in 1845. He took his M.A. there in 1848.

Most of Burgon's adult life was spent at Oxford, as Fellow of Oriel College and then as vicar of St. Mary's (the University Church) and Greshem Professor of Divinity. During his last twelve years he was Dean of Chichester.

The thing about Burgon, which lifts him out of his nineteenth century English setting and endears him to the hearts of earnest Christians of other lands and other ages is his steadfast defense of the Scriptures as the infallible Word of God. He strove with all his power to arrest the modernistic currents which during his lifetime had begun to flow within the Church of England, continuing his efforts unabated zeal up to the very day of his death. With this purpose in mind he labored mightily in the field of New Testament textual criticism. In 1860, while temporary chaplain of the English congregation at Rome, he made a personal examination of Codex B, and in 1862 he inspected, and in 1862 he inspected the treasures of St. Catherine's Convent on Mt. Sinai. Later he made several tours of European libraries, examining and collating New Testament manuscripts wherever he went.

It is on the strength of these labors that K.W. Clark ranks him with Tregelles and Schrivener as one of the "great contemporaries" of Tischendorf.

Burgon, unlike most other textual critics, was always careful to remember that the New Testament is not an ordinary book but a special book, a book which was written under the infallible inspiration of the Holy Spirit, a book whose text Christ has promised to preserve in His Church down through the ages. Burgon regarded the Divine inspiration and providential preservation of the New Testament as two fundamental facts which must be taken into account in the interpretation of the details of New Testament textual criticism, two basic verities which make the textual criticism of the New Testament different from the textual criticism of any other book.

A Revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament, claiming to have been executed by authority of the Convocation of the Southern Province, and declaring itself to be the exclusive property of our two ancient Universities, has recently been put forth; of which the essential feature proves to be, that it is founded on *an entirely New Revision of the received Greek Text.*

To construct a new Greek Text formed no part of the instructions which the Revisionists received at the hands of the Committee of the Southern Province. Rather were they warned against venturing on such an experiment; the fundamental principle of the entire undertaking having been declared at the outset to be -- that *"a Revision of the Authorized Version"* is desirable; and the fundamental rule laid down for the revising body being that they should *"introduce into the Text as few alterations as possible consistent with faithfulness."* It cannot of course be denied that this last clause set the door inconveniently wide open for innovation. But then, a limit was prescribed to the amount of license which might possibly result, by the insertion of a proviso, which however is found to have been disregarded by the Revisionists almost entirely. The condition was imposed upon them that whenever *"decidedly preponderating evidence"* constrained their adoption of some change in "the Text from which the Authorized Version was made," *they should indicate such alteration in the margin".* Will it be believed that, this notwithstanding, *not one* of the many alterations which have been introduced into the original text is distinctly so commemorated.

It can never be any question among scholars, that a fatal error was committed when a body of Divines, appointed *to revise the Authorized English Version* of the

New Testament Scriptures, addressed themselves to the solution of an entirely different and far more intricate problem, namely *the reconstruction of the Greek Text.*

But there is clearly a question of prior interest and infinitely greater importance, which has to be settled first: namely, the merits or demerits of *the changes which the same Scholars have taken upon themselves to introduce into the Greek text.*

But in fact the treatment which the N. T. has experienced at the hands of the Revisionists recalls the fate of some ancient edifice which confessedly required to be painted, papered, scoured, -- with a minimum of masons' and carpenters' work, -- in order to be inhabited with comfort for the next hundred years: but the contractors for the job were so ill-advised as to persuade themselves that it required to be to a great extent rebuilt: accordingly, in an evil hour they set about removing foundations, and did so much structural mischief that in the end it became necessary to proceed against them for damages.

The provision, then, which the Divine Author of Scripture is found to have made for the preservation in its integrity of His written Word, is of a peculiarly varied and highly complex description. First, -- By causing that a vast multiplication of COPIES should be required all down the ages -- beginning at the earliest period, and continuing in a ever-increasing ratio until the actual invention of printing, -- He provided the most effectual security imaginable against fraud. True, that millions of the copies so produced have long since perished: but it is nevertheless a plain fact that there survive of the Gospel alone upwards of one thousand copies to the present day.

Next, VERSIONS. The necessity of translating the Scriptures into divers languages for the use of different branches of the early Church, procured that many an authentic record has been preserved of the New Testament as it existed in the first few centuries of the Christian era. Thus, the Peschito Syrian and the old Latin version are believed to have been translated during this period and the two Egyptian translations in the 3rd and 4th. The Vulgate (or revised Latin) and the Gothic belong to the 4th: the Armenian, and possibly the Æthiopic, to the 5th.

Lastly, the requirements of assailants and apologists alike, the business of commentators, the needs of controversialists and teachers in every age, have resulted in a vast accumulation of additional evidence, of which it is scarcely possible to overestimate the importance. For in this way it has come to pass that every famous Doctor of the Church in turn has quoted more or less largely from the sacred writings, and thus has borne testimony to the contents of the codices with which he was individually familiar. PATRISTIC CITATIONS accordingly are a third great safeguard of the integrity of the deposit.

And first, the reader should be apprised (with reference to the first-named class of evidence) that most of our extant copies of the N. T. Scriptures are comparatively of recent date, ranging from the 10th to the 14th century of our era. That these are in every instance copies of yet older manuscripts, is self-evident: and that in the main they represent faithfully the sacred autographs themselves, no reasonable person doubts. The fact however remains, that they *are* thus separated by about a thousand years from their inspired archetypes. Readers are reminded, in passing, that the little handful of copies, on which we rely for the texts of Herodotus and Thucydides, of Æschylus

and Sophocles, are removed from *their* originals by full 500 years more: and that, instead of a thousand, or half a thousand copies, we are dependent for the text of certain of these authors on as many copies as may be counted on the fingers of one hand. In truth, the security which the Text of the New Testament enjoys is altogether unique and extraordinary. To specify one single consideration, which has never yet attracted nearly the amount of attention it deserves, -- 'Lectionaries' abound, which establish the Text which has been publicly read in the churches of the East, from at least A.D. 400 until the time of the invention of printing.

But here an important consideration claims special attention. We have to allude to the result of increased acquaintance with certain of the oldest extant Codices of the N.T. Two of these, viz. a copy in the Vatican technically indicated by the letter B, and the recently discovered Sinaitic, styled after the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, ℵ, are thought to belong to the 4th century: -- two are assigned to the 5th, viz. the Alexandrian (A) in the British Museum, and the rescript Codex preserved at Paris, designated C: -- one is probably of the 6th, viz. the Codex Bezæ (D) preserved at Cambridge. Singular to relate, the first, second, fourth, and fifth of these Codices (B ℵ C D), but especially B and ℵ, have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendency over the imagination of the critics, which can only be fitly spoken of as a blind superstition. It matters nothing that all four are discovered on careful scrutiny to differ essentially, not only from ninety-nine out of a hundred of the whole body of extant MSS. besides, but even *from one another*. This last circumstance, obviously fatal to their corporate pretensions, is unaccountable overlooked. And yet it admits of only one

satisfactory explanation: viz. that *in different degrees* they all five exhibit a fabricated text. Between the first two (B and ℵ) there subsists an amount of sinister resemblance, which proves that they must have been both derived at no very remote period from the same corrupt original. Yet do they stand asunder in every page, as well as differ widely from the commonly received Text, with which they have been carefully collated. In the Gospels alone, B is found to omit at least 2877 words; to add, 536; to substitute, 935; to transpose, 2098; to modify, 1132 (in all 7578); -- the corresponding figures for ℵ being severally 3455, 839, 1114, 2299, 1265 (in all 8972). And be it remembered that the omissions, additions, substitutions, transpositions, and modifications, *are by no means the same* in both. It is in fact *easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two MSS. differ the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree.*

But by far the most depraved text is that exhibited by Codex D. 'No known manuscript contains so many bold and extensive interpolations. Its variations from the sacred Text are beyond all other example.'[1] This, however, is not the result of its being the most recent of the five, but (singular to relate) is due to quite an opposite cause. 'When we turn to the Acts of the Apostles,' (says the learned editor of the codes, Dr. Scrivener) -- 'We find ourselves confronted with a text, the like to which we have no experience of elsewhere. It is hardly an exaggeration to assert that Codex D reproduces the *Textus receptus* much in the same way that one of the best Chaldee Targums does the Hebrew of the Old Testament: so wide are the variations in the diction, so constant and inveterate the practice of expounding the narrative by means of interpolations which seldom recommend themselves as genuine by even a semblance of internal probability.'

'Sæpe dubites per ludumne an serio scripta legas,' -- is Tischendorf's blunt estimate of the text of that codex. Though a considerable portion of the Gospels is missing, in what remains we find 3704 words omitted, no less than 2213 added, and 2121 substituted. The words transposed amount to 3471, and 1772 have been modified: the deflections from the received text thus amounting in all to 13,281. -- Next after D, the most untrustworthy codex is ℵ, which bears on its front a memorable note of the evil repute under which it has always laboured: viz. it is found that at least ten revisers between the 4th and the 12th centuries busied themselves with the task of correcting its many and extraordinary perversions of the truth of Scripture. -- Next in impurity comes B: -- then, the fragmentary codex C: Our own A being, beyond all doubt, disfigured by the fewest blemishes of any.

What precedes admits to some extent of further numerical illustration. It is discovered that in the 111 (out of 320) pages of a copy of Lloyd's Greek Testament, in which alone these five manuscripts are collectively available for comparison in the Gospels, -- the serious deflections of A from the *Textus receptus* amount in all to only 842; whereas in C they amount to 1798; in B, to 2370; in ℵ, to 3392; in D, to 4697. The readings *peculiar to* A within the same limits are 133; those peculiar to C are 170. But those of B amount to 197, while ℵ exhibits 443, and the readings peculiar to D (within the same limits), are no fewer than 1829... We submit that these facts are not altogether calculated to inspire confidence in Codices B ℵ C D.

But let the learned chairman of the New Testament company of Revisionists (Bp. Ellicott) be heard on this subject. He is characterizing these same 'old uncials,' which it is just now the fashion to hold up as oracular, and

to which his lordship is almost as devotedly attached as his neighbours: --

'The simplicity and dignified conciseness' (he says) *'of the Vatican manuscript (B); the greater expansiveness of our own Alexandrian (A); the partially mixed characteristics of the Sinaitic (ℵ); the paraphrastis tone of the singular Codex Bezæ (D), are now brought home to the student.*[2]

Could ingenuity have devised a severer satire than such a description of four professing *transcripts* of a book; and *that* book, the everlasting Gospel itself? -- transcripts, be it observed in passing, on which it is just now the fashion to rely implicitly for the very orthography of proper names, -- the spelling of common words, -- the minutiæ of grammar. What (we ask) would be thought of four such *'copies'* of Thucydides or of Shakespeare? Imagine it gravely proposed, by the aid of four such conflicting documents, to re-adjust the text of the funeral oration of Pericles, or to re-edit 'Hamlet'. *Risum teneatis amici*? Why, some of the poet's most familiar lines would become scarcely recognizable: e.g., A--*'Toby or not Toby; that is the question'*; B--*'Tob or not, is the question'*; ℵ--*'To be a tub, or not to be a tub; the question is that'*; C--*'The question is, to beat, or not to beat Toby?'*: D (the 'singular codes'),--*'The only question is this: to beat that Toby; or to be a tub?'*

We venture to assure him, without a particle of hesitation, that ℵ B D are *three of the most corrupt copies extant*: have become, by whatever process (for their history is wholly unknown), the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings and ancient blunders which are anywhere to be met with.

But (we shall be asked) what is the amount of *agreement* between these 5 codeces? for *that*, after all, is

the practical question. We answer, -- A has been already shown to stand alone twice; B, 6 times; ℵ, 8 times; C, 15 times; D, 93 times. We have further to state that A B stand by themselves once; B ℵ, 4 times; B C, 1; B D, 1; ℵ C, 1; C D, 1. A ℵ C conspire 1; B ℵ C, 1; B ℵ D, 1; A B ℵ C, *once* (viz. in reading ἐρώτησεν, which Tischendorf admits to be a corrupt reading); B ℵ C D, also *once*. The 5 'old uncials' therefore (A B ℵ C D) combine, and again stand apart, with singular impartiality. Lastly, they are *never once* found to be in accord in respect of *any single 'various reading'*. Will any one, after a candid survey of the premisses, deem us unreasonable, if we avow that such a specimen of the *concordia discors* which everywhere prevails between the oldest uncials, but which especially characterizes ℵ B D, indisposes us greatly to suffer their unsupported authority to determine for us the text of Scripture?

The practical result, in fact, of what has been hitherto offered is after all but this, that we have to be on our guard against pinning our faith exclusively on two or three, -- least of all on one or two ancient documents; an of adopting *them* exclusively for our guides.

Happily, our manuscripts are numerous: most of them are in the main trustworthy; *all* of them represent far older documents than themselves. Our Versions (two of which are more ancient by a couple of centuries than any sacred codex extant) severally correct and check one another. Lastly, in the writings of a host of Fathers,--the principal being Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, Didymus, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, the Cyrils, Theodoret,--we are provided with contemporaneous evidence which, whenever it can be had, becomes an effectual safeguard against the unsupported decrees of our oldest codices, A B ℵ C D, as well as the occasional vagaries of the Versions. No more

precarious foundation for a reading, in fact, can be named, than the unsupported advocacy of a single manuscript, or Version, or Father; or even of two or three of these combined.

But indeed the principle involved in the foregoing remarks admits of being far more broadly stated. It even stands to reason that we may safely reject any reading which, out of the whole body of available authorities,--manuscripts, versions, Fathers,--finds an advocate nowhere save in one and the same little handful of suspicious documents. For we resolutely maintain, that external Evidence must after all remain our best, our only safe guide; and (to come to the point) we refuse to throw in our lot with those who, disregarding the witness of *every other* known codex--all the versions--and *every other* available ecclesiastical writer,--insist on following the dictates of a little handful of authorities, of which nothing is known with certainty except that, when they concur exclusively, it is often demonstrably only to mislead. We speak of codices B or ℵ or D; the 9th century codex L, and such cursives[3] as 13 or 33; a few copies of the old Latin and one of the Egyptian versions: perhaps Origen. Not theory therefore: not prejudice: not conjecture: not unproved assertion: not codex B: not an imaginary 'Antiochene recension' of another imaginary 'Præ-Syrian text': not antecedent fancies about the affinity of documents: nothing of this sort (however specious and plausible it may sound, especially when set forth in magisterial language and recommended by justly respected names),--nothing of this sort, we say, must be allowed to determine for us the text of Scripture. We deem it even axiomatic, that, in every case of doubt, our critical method must be the same: namely, after patiently collecting *all* the available evidence, then without partiality or prejudice to adjudicate between the conflicting authorities, and loyally

to accept that verdict for which there is clearly the preponderating evidence. *The best supported reading*, in other words, must always be held to be *the true reading*: and nothing may on any account be rejected from the commonly received Text, except on evidence which shall *clearly* outweigh the evidence for retaining it.

But, (we shall perhaps be asked,) has any critical editor of the N.T. seriously taught the reverse of all this? Yes, indeed, we answer. Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf,--the most recent and most famous of modern editors,--have all three adopted a directly opposite theory of textual revision. With the first-named, fifty years ago(1831), virtually originated the principle of recurring exclusively to a few ancient documents to the exclusion of the many. 'LACHMANN'S text seldom rests on more than four Greek codices, very often on three, not as frequently on two, *sometimes on only one*.'[4] Of the Greek Fathers (he said) he employed *only Origen*.[5] Paying extraordinary deference to the Latin Version, he entirely disregarded the coeval Syriac translation. The result of such a system must needs prove satisfactory to no one except its author.

Lachmann's leading fallacy has perforce proved fatal to the value of the text put forth by Dr. TREGELLES. Of the scrupulous accuracy, the indefatigable industry, the pious zeal of that estimable and devoted scholar, we speak not. All honour to his memory! As a specimen of conscientious labour, his edition of the N.T. (1857-72) passes praise, and will *never* lose its value. But it has only to be stated, that Tregelles effectually persuaded himself that '*eighty-nine ninetieths*' of our extant manuscripts and other authorities may safely be rejected and lost sight of when we come to amend the text and try to restore it to its primitive purity,[6]--to make it plain that in Textual Criticism he must needs be regarded as an untrustworthy

teacher. *Why* he should have condescended to employ no patristic authority later than Eusebius [fl. A.D. 320], he does not explain.

With DR. TISCHENDORF--(whom one vastly his superior in learning, accuracy, and judgment, has generously styled 'the first Biblical Critic in Europe'[7])--'*the evidence of codex* ℵ, supported or even unsupported by one or two other authorities of any description, is sufficient to outweigh any other witnesses, whether manuscripts, versions, or ecclesiastical writers.'[8] We need say no more. Until the foregoing charge has been disproved, Dr. Tischendorf's edition of the N.T., however precious as an unrivalled storehouse of materials for criticism,--however admirable as a specimen of unwearied industry, critical learning, and first-rate ability,--must be admitted to be utterly untrustworthy as a guide to the truth of the inspired Text. It has been ascertained that his discovery of codex ℵ caused his 8th edition (1865-72) to differ from his 7th in no less than 3369 places,--'to the scandal of the science of Comparative Criticism, as well as to his own grave discredit for discernment and consistency.'[9] But, in fact, what is to be thought of a critic who,--because the last verse of S. John's Gospel in ℵ seemed to himself to be *written with a different pen* from the rest,--has actually *omitted that last verse entirely*, in defiance of *every known copy, every known version*, and the explicit testimony of *a host of Fathers*? Such are Origen (10 times),--Eusebius (3),--Gregory Nyss. (2),--Gregory Nazian.,--Nonnus,--Chrysostom (6),--Theodorus Mops.,--Isidorus,--Cyril Alex. (2),--Victor Ant., -- Ammonius, -- Severus, -- Maximus, -- Andreas Creten., -- Ambrose, -- Gaudentius, -- Philastrius, -- Sedulius, -- Jerome, -- Augustine (6).

The last to enter the field are DRS. WESTCOTT and HORT, whose beautifully-printed edition of 'the New Testament in the original Greek' was published *on the*

same day with the 'Revised Authorized Version' itself, a copy of their work having been already confidentially entrusted to every member of the N. Test. company of Revisionists to guide them in their labours. The learned Editors candidly avow, that they 'have deliberately chosen on the whole to rely for documentary evidence on the stores accumulated by their predecessors, and to confine themselves to their predecessors, and to confine themselves to their proper work of editing the text itself.'[10] Nothing therefore has to be enquired after, except the critical principles on which they have proceeded. And, after assuring us that 'the study of grouping is the foundation of all enduring Criticism'[11] they produce their secret: viz. that in 'every one of our witnesses' *except codex* B, the 'corruptions are innumerable';[12] and that, in the Gospels, the one'group of witnesses' of *'incomparable value,'* is codex B in 'combination with another primary Greek manuscript, as ℵ B, B L, B C, B T, B D, B Ξ, A B, B Z, B 33, and in S. Mark B Δ.'[13] This is 'Textual Criticism made easy,' certainly. Well aware of the preposterous results to which such a major premiss must inevitably lead, we are not surprised to find a plea straightway put in for *'instinctive processes of Criticism,'* of which *the foundation 'needs perpetual correction and recorrection.'* But our confidence fairly gives way when, in the same breath, the accomplished Editors proceed as follows:--'But we are obliged to come to *the individual mind* at last; and canons of criticism are useful only as warnings against natural illusions, and aids to circumspect consideration, not as absolute rules to prescribe the final decision. It is true that no individual mind can ever work with perfect uniformity, or free itself completely from its own idiosyncrasies. Yet a clear sense of the danger of unconscious caprice may do much towards excluding it. We trust also that the present text

has escaped some risks of this kind by being the joint production of two editors of different habits of mind.'[14] A somewhat insecure safeguard surely! May we be permitted without offence to point out that the 'idiosyncrasies' of an 'individual mind' (to which we learn with astonishment 'we are obliged to come at last') are probably the very worst foundation possible on which to build the recension of an inspired writing? With regret we record our conviction, that these accomplished scholars have succeeded in producing a Text vastly more remote from the inspired autographs of the Evangelists than any which has appeared since the invention of printing. When full Prolegomena have been furnished, we shall know more about the matter;[15] but, to judge from the Remarks (p. 541-62) which the learned Editors (Revisionists themselves) have subjoined to their elegantly-printed volume, it is to be feared that the fabric will be found to rest too exclusively on vague assumption and unproved hypothesis. In other words, a painful apprehension is created, that their edition of 'The New Testament in the original Greek' will be found to partake inconveniently of the nature of a work of the imagination. As codex ℵ proved fatal to Dr. Tischendorf, so is codex B evidently the rock on which Drs. Westcott and Hort have split.

But surely (rejoins the intelligent reader, coming fresh to these studies), the oldest extant manuscripts (B ℵ A C D) *must* exhibit the purest text! Is it not so? It *ought* to be so, no doubt (we answer); but it certainly *need not* be the case.

We know that Origen in Palestine, Lucian at Antioch, Hesychius in Egypt, 'revised' the text of the N.T. Unfortunately, they did their work in an age when such fatal misapprehension prevailed on the subject, that each in turn will have inevitable imported a fresh assortment of *monstra* into the sacred writings. Add, the

baneful influence of such spirits as Theophilus (sixth Bishop of Antioch, A.D. 168), Tatian, Ammonius, &c., of whom there must have been a vast number in the primitive age,--some of whose productions, we know for certain, were freely multiplied in every quarter of ancient Christendom: add, the fabricated gospels which anciently abounded; notable the 'Gospel of the Hebrews,' about which Jerome is so communicative, and which (he says) he had translated into Greek and Latin: lastly, freely grant that, here and there, with well-meant assiduity, the orthodox themselves may have sought to prop up truths which the early heretics (Basilides [134], Valentinus [140] with his disciple Heracleon, Marcion [150], and rest) most perseveringly assailed;--and we have sufficiently explained how it comes to pass that not a few of the codices of ancient Christendom must have exhibited a text which was even scandalously corrupt. 'It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound,' writes the most learned of the Revisionist body, 'that the worst corruptions, to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed: that Irenæus [A.D. 150] and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus.'[16]

And what else are codices ℵ B C D but *specimens--in vastly different degrees--of the class thus characterized* by Dr. Scrivener? Nay, who will venture to deny that those codices are indebted for their preservation *solely* to the circumstance, that they were long since recognized as the depositories of readings which rendered them utterly untrustworthy?

Only by singling out some definite portion of the Gospels, and attending closely to the handling it has

experienced at the hands of A ℵ B C D--to the last four of which it is just now the fashion to bow down as to an oracular voice from which there shall be no appeal--can the student become fully aware of the hopelessness of any attempt to reconstruct the text of the N.T. out of the materials which those codices supply. Let us this time take S. Mark's account of the healing of 'the paralytic borne of four' (ch. ii. 1-12). In the course of those 12 verses (not reckoning 4 blunders and certain peculiarities of spelling) there will be found to be 60 variations of reading,--of which, 55 are nothing else but depravations of the text, the result of inattention or licentiousness. Westcott and Hort adopt 23 of these:--18, in which ℵ B conspire to vouch for a reading: 2, where ℵ is unsupported by B: 2, where B is unsupported by ℵ: 1, where C D are supported by neither ℵ nor B. Now, in the present instance the 'five old uncials' *cannot be* the depositories of a tradition,--whether Western or Eastern,--because they render inconsistent testimony *in every verse*. It must further be admitted (for this is really not a question of opinion, but a plain matter of fact), that it is unreasonable to place confidence in such documents. What would be thought in a Court of Law of five witnesses, called up 47 times for examination, who should be observed to bear contradictory testimony *every time*?

But the whole of the problem does not by any means lie on the surface. All that *appears* is that the five oldest uncials are not trustworthy witnesses, which singly in the course of 12 verses separate themselves from their fellows 33 times: viz. A, twice; ℵ, 5 times; B, 6 times; C, thrice; D, 17 times: and which also enter into the 11 following combinations with one another in opposition to the ordinary Text:--A C, twice; ℵ B, 10 times; ℵ D, once; C D, 3 times; ℵ B C, once; ℵ B D, 5 times; ℵ C D, once; ℵ B C D, once; A ℵ C D, once; A B C D, once; A ℵ B C D, once.

(Note that, on this last occasion, which is the *only* time when they all 5 agree, *they are certainly all 5 wrong*.) But this, as was observed before, lies on the surface. On closer inspection, it is further discovered that their testimony betrays the baseness of their origin by its intrinsic worthlessness. Thus, in ver. 1, the delicate precision of the announcement ἠκούσθη ὁτι ΕΙΣ' ΟΙΚΟΝ ·ΕΣΤΙ (that '*He has gone in*') disappears from ℵ B D:--as well as (in ver. 2) the circumstance that it became the signal for many '*immediately*' (ℵ B) to assemble about the door. In ver. 4, S. Mark explains his predecessor's concise statement that the paralytic was 'brought to' our SAVIOUR,[17] by remarking that the thing was '*impossible*' by the ordinary method of approach. Accordingly, his account of the expedient resorted to by the bearers fills one entire verse (ver. 4) of his Gospel. In the mean time, ℵ B by exhibiting in S. Mark ii. 3, 'bringing unto Him one sick of the palsy' (φέροντες πρὸς αὐτόν παραλυτικόν,—which is but a senseless transposition of πρὸς αὐτὸν, παραλυτικὸν φέροντες), do their best to obliterate the exquisite significancy of the second Evangelist's method. In the next verse, the perplexity of the bearers, who, because they could not '*come nigh* Him' (προσέγγισαι αὐτῷ), unroofed the house, is lost is ℵ B,—whose προσενέγκαι has been obtained either from Matt. ix. 2, or else from Lu. v. 18, 19 (εἰσενεγκεῖν, εἰσενέγκωσιν). 'The bed WHERE WAS the paralytic' (Τὸν κράββατον ΟΠΟΥ ΗΝ ὁ παραλυτικός, in imitation of 'the roof WHERE WAS' Jesus (τὴν στέγην ΟΠΟΥ ΗΝ [ὁ Ἰησοῦς], which had immediately preceded), is just one of those tasteless depravations, for which ℵ B, and especially D, are conspicuous among manuscripts. In the last verse, the *instantaneous rising* of the paralytic, noticed by S. Mark (ἠγέρθη εὐθέως(and insisted upon by S. Luke ('*and immediately he rose up*

before them,'—καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν), is obliterated by shifting εὐθέως in ℵ B and C to a place where ευθές is not wanted and where its significancy disappears.

Other instances of assimilation are conspicuous. All must see that, in ver. 5, καὶ ἰδών (ℵ B C) is derived from Matt. ix. 2 and Luke v. 20: as well as that 'Son *be of good cheer*' (C) is imported hither from Matt. ix. 2. '*My son*,' on the other hand (ℵ), is a mere effort of the imagination. In the same verse, σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (ℵ B D) is either from Matt. ix. 5 (sic): or else from ver 9 lower down in S. Mark's narrative. Λέγοντες in ver. 6 (D) is from Luke v. 21. Ὕπαγε (ℵ) in ver. 9. and ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἰκόν σου (D), are clearly importations from ver. 11. The strange confusion in ver. 7,--'*Why doth this man thus speak? He blasphemeth*' (ℵ D),--is due solely to Matt. ix. 3 :--while the appendix proposed by ℵ as a substitute for 'We never saw it on this fashion' (οὐδέποτε οὕτως εἴδομεν), in ver. 12 (viz. 'It was never so seen in Israel.' οὐδέποτε οὕτως ἐφάνη ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ), has been transplanted hither from Matt. ix. 33.

We shall perhaps be told that, scandalously corrupt as the text of ℵ B C D hereabouts may be, no reason has been shown as yet for suspecting that *heretical* depravation ever had anything to do with such phenomena. *That* (we answer) is only because the writings of the early depravers and fabricators of Gospels have universally perished. From the slender relics of their iniquitous performances which have survived to our time, we are sometimes able to lay our finger on a foul blot, and to say, '*This* came from Tatian's Diatessaron; and *that* from Marcion's mutilated recension of the Gospel according to S. Luke.' The piercing of our SAVIOUR'S side, transplanted by codices ℵ B C from S. John xix. 34 into S. Matt. xxvii. 49, is an instance of the former,--which it may reasonably create

astonishment to find that Drs. Westcott and Hort (alone among editors) have nevertheless admitted into their text, as equally trustworthy with the last 12 verses of S. Mark's Gospel. But its occasions a stronger sentiment than surprise to discover that this, 'the gravest interpolation yet laid to the charge of B,'--this ' sentence which neither they nor any other competent scholar can possibly believe that the Evangelist ever wrote,'[21] --has been actually foisted into the margin of the Revised Version of S. Matt. xxvii. 49. Were not the Revisionists aware that such a disfigurement must prove fatal to their work? *For whose* benefit is the information volunteered that 'many ancient authorities ' are thus grossly interpolated?

An instructive specimen of depravation follows, which can be traced to Marcion's mutilated recension of S. Luke's Gospel. We venture to entreat the favour of the reader's sustained attention to the license with which the Lord's Prayer as given in S. Luke's Gospel (xi. 2-4), is exhibited by codices ℵ A B C D. For every reason one would have expected that so precious a formula would have been found enshrined in the 'old uncials' in peculiar safety; handled by copyists of the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries with peculiar reverence. Let us ascertain exactly what has befallen it:--

(a) D introduces it by interpolating the following free paraphrase of Matt. vi. 7 :-- '*Use not vain repetitions as the rest: for some suppose that they shall be heard by their much speaking. But when ye pray*'... After which portentous exordium,

(b) B ℵ omit the 5 words, '*Our*' '*which art in heaven.*' Then,

(c) D omits the article (τὸ) before 'name': and supplements the first petition with the words 'upon us' (ἐφ' ἡμᾶς). It must needs also transpose the words '*Thy Kingdom*' (ἡ βασιλεία σου).

(d) B in turn omits the third petition,--'*Thy will be done, as in heaven, also on the earth*'; which 11 words ℵ retains, but adds 'so' before 'also,' and omits the article (*τῆς*); finding for once an ally in A C D.

(e) ℵ D for *δίδου* write *δός* (from Matt.)

(f) ℵ omits the article (*τό*) before '*day by day.*' And,

(g) D, instead of the 3 last-named words, writes '*this day*' from Matt.): substitutes '*debts*' (*τὰ ὀφειλήματα*) for '*sins*' (*τὰ ἁμαρτήματα*,--also from Matt.): and in place of '*for [we] ourselves*' (*καὶ γὰρ αὐτοί*) writes '*as also we*' (*ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς*, again from Matt.). But,

(h) ℵ shows its sympathy with D by accepting two-thirds of this last blunder: exhibiting as also [we] ourselves' (*ὡς καὶ αὐτοί*).

(i) D consistently reads '*our debtors*' (*τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν*) in place of '*every one that is indebted to us*' (*παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν*). Finally,

(j) D ℵ omit the last petition,--' *but deliver us from evil*' (*ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*)--unsupported by A C or D. Of lesser discrepancies we decline to take account.

So then, these five 'first-class authorities' are found to throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from S. Luke's way of exhibiting the Lord's Prayer,--which, among them, they contrive to falsify in respect of no less than 45 words; and yet *they are never able to agree among themselves as to any single various reading:* while *only once* are more than two of them observed to stand together,-viz. in the unauthorized insertion of the article. In respect of 32 (out of 45) words, *they bear in turn solitary evidence.* What need to declare that it is *certainly false* in every instance? Such however is the infatuation of the critics, that the vagaries of B are all

taken for gospel. Besides omitting the 11 words which B omits jointly with ℵ, Drs. Westcott and Hort erase from the Book of Life those other 11 precious words which are omitted by B only. And in this way it comes to pass that the mutilated condition to which the scalpel of Marcion the heretic reduced the LORD'S Prayer some 1780 years ago[22] (for the mischief can all be traced back to *him*!), is palmed off on the Church of England by the Revisionist as the work of the Sacred Writers!

(A) We may now proceed with our examination of their work, beginning-- as Dr. Roberts, one of the Revisionists, does in his work explaining the method and results of their labours-- with what we hold to be the gravest Blot of all, viz. the marks of serious suspicion which we find set against the last 12 verses of S. Mark's Gospel. Well may the learned writer anticipate that-- 'The reader will be struck by the appearance which this long paragraph presents in the Revised Version. Although inserted, it is marked off by a considerable space from the rest of the Gospel. A note is also placed in the margin containing a brief explanation of this.'[23]

He refers to the words-- 'The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from ver. 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel.'

But now,-- For the use of *whom* has this piece of information been volunteered? Not for learned readers certainly: it being familiarly known to all that codices B and ℵ *alone of manuscripts* (to their own effectual condemnation) omit these 12 verses. But then scholars know something more about the matter. They also know that these 12 verses have been made the subject of a separate treatise extending to upwards of 300 pages,-- which treatise has now been before the world for a full decade of years, and for the best of reasons has never yet

been answered. Its object, stated on its title-page, was to vindicate against recent critical objectors, and to establish 'the last Twelve Verses' of S. Mark's Gospel.[24] Moreover, competent judges at once admitted that the author had succeeded in doing what he undertook to do.[25] *Can* it then be right (we respectfully enquire) still to insinuate into unlearned minds distrust of twelve consecutive verses of the everlasting Gospel, which yet have been demonstrated to be as trustworthy as any other verses which can be named?

The question arises, But how did it come to pass that such evil counsels were allowed to prevail in the Jerusalem Chamber? Light has been let into the subject by two of the New Testament company. And first by Dr. Newth, who has been at the pains to describe the method which was pursued on such occasions. The practice (he informs us) was as follows. The Bishop of Gloncester and Bristol as chairman, asks--

'Whether any *textual* changes are proposed? The evidence for and against is briefly stated, and the proposal considered. The duty of stating this evidence is by tacit consent devolved (*sic*) upon two members of the Company, who from their previous studies are specially entitled to speak with authority upon such questions,-- Dr. Scrivener and *Dr. Hort*,-- and who come prepared to enumerate particularly the authorities on either side. Dr. Scrivener opens up the matter by stating the facts of the case, and by giving his judgment on the bearings of the evidence. Dr. Hort follows, and mentions any additional matters that may call for notice, and if differing from Dr. Scrivener's estimate of the weight of the evidence, gives his reasons and states his own view. After discussion, the vote of the Company is taken, and the proposed reading accepted or rejected. *The text being thus settled* the Chairman asks for proposals on the remainder.'[26]

And thus the men who were appointed to improve *the English Translation*, are exhibited to as remodelling *the original Greek.* At a moment's notice, as if by intuition, these eminent Divines undertake to decide which shall be deemed the genuine words of the Sacred Writers, and which *not.* Each is called upon to give his vote, and he gives it. '*The Text being thus settled*,' they proceed to do the only thing they were originally appointed to do; viz. to try their hands at improving our Authorized Version. But we venture respectfully to suggest, that by no such 'rough-and-ready' process is that most delicate and difficult of all critical problems-- the truth of Scripture-- to be 'settled.'

We naturally cast about for some evidence that the members of the New Testament company possess that mastery of the subject which alone could justify one of their number (Dr. Milligan) in asserting roundly that these 12 verses are '*not from the pen of S. Mark himself*;'[27] and another (Dr. Roberts) in maintaining that 'the passage is *not the immediate production of S. Mark.*'[28] Dr. Roberts assures us that--

'Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, Severus of Antioch, Jerome, as well as other writers, especially Greeks, testify that these verses were not written by S. Mark, or not found in the best copies.'[29]

Will the learned writer permit us to assure him in return that he is entirely mistaken? He is requested to believe that Gregory of Nyssa says nothing of the sort-- *says nothing at all* concerning these verses: that Victor of Antioch vouches emphatically for their *genuineness*: that Severus does but copy, while Jerome does but translate, a few random expressions of Eusebius : and that Eusebius himself *nowhere* 'testifies that these verses were not written by S. Mark.' So far from it, Eusebius actually *quotes the verses*, quotes them as *genuine.* Dr. Roberts is further assured that there are *no* 'other writers,' whether

Greek or Latin, who insinuate doubt concerning these verses. On the contrary, besides *both* the Latin and *all the* Syriac-- besides the Gothic and the *two* Egyptian versions-- there exist four authorities of the 2nd century: as many of the 3rd; five of the 5th; four of the 6th; as many of the 7th;-- together with *at least ten* of the 4th [30] (*contemporaries therefore of codices* D *and* ℵ);-- which actually recognize the verses in question. Now, when to *every known manuscript but two* of bad character,-- besides *every ancient Version,-- some one-and-thirty Fathers* are added , 18 of whom must have used copies at least as old as either B or ℵ,-- Dr. Roberts is assured that an amount of external authority has been accumulated which is simply impregnable in discussions of this nature. But the significance of a single circumstance, of which up to this point nothing has been said, is alone sufficient to determine the controversy. We refer to the fact that *in every part of Eastern Christendom* these same 12 verses-- neither more nor less-- have been from the earliest recorded period, and still are, a *proper lesson both for the Easter season and for Ascension Day.*

Let the learned reader then ascertain for himself the character of codices ℵ A B C D hereabouts, by collating *the context in which S. Luke* ii. 14 *is found*, viz. the 13 verses which precede and the one verse (ver. 15) which immediately follows. If the old uncials are observed all to sing in tune throughout, hereabouts, well and good: but if, on the contrary, their voices prove utterly discordant, *who* sees not that the last pretence has been taken away for placing *any confidence at all* in their testimony concerning the text of ver. 14, turning as it does on the presence or absence of *a single letter*? He will find, as the result of his analysis, that within the space of those 14 verses, the old uncials are responsible for 56 'various

readings' (so-called): singly, for 41; in combination with one another, for 15. So diverse, however, is the testimony they respectively render, that they are found severally to differ from the text of the cursives no less than 70 times. Among them, besides twice varying the phrase, they contrive to omit 19 words: to add 4: to substitute 17: to alter 10: to transpose 24. Lastly, these five codices are observed (within the same narrow limits) to fall into *ten* different combinations: viz. B ℵ, for 5 readings; B D, for 2; ℵ C, ℵ D, A C, ℵ B D, A ℵ D, A B ℵ D, B ℵ C D, A B ℵ C D, for 1 each. A therefore, which stands alone *twice*, is found in combinations 4 times; C, which stands alone *once*, is found in combination 4 times;[31] B, which stands alone 5 times, is found in combination 6 times; ℵ,which stands alone 11 times, is found in combination 8 times; D, which stands alone 22 times, is found in combination 7 times. . . . And now, with what show of reason (we ask) can the reading εὐδοκίας (of ℵ A B D) be upheld as genuine, in defiance of *the whole body of the manuscripts*, uncial and cursive, and the mighty array of Fathers exhibited above?

(*c*) Take a yet grosser specimen, which has nevertheless imposed just as completely upon our Revisionists. It is found in S. Luke's gospel (xxiii. 44), and belongs to the history of the Crucifixion. All are aware that as, at the typical redemption out of Egypt, there had been a preternatural darkness over the land for three days,[32] so, preliminary to the actual exodus of 'the Israel of God,' 'there was darkness over all the land' for three hours.[33] S. Luke adds the further statement, -- '*And the sun was darkened*' (καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος). Now the proof that this is what S. Luke actually wrote is the most obvious and conclusive possible. It is found in all the most ancient documents. Marcion[34] (whose date is A.D. 130-50) so exhibits the place: besides the old Latin,[35]

the Vulgate,and the three Syriac versions. Hippolytus[36] (190-227), Athanasius,[37] Ephraem Syrus,[38] Nilus the monk,[39] Cyril of Alexandria,[40] the apocryphal 'gospel of Nicodemus,' and the 'Anaphora Pilati,'[41] are all witnesses to the same effect. But the most striking evidence is the consentient testimony of the manuscripts, viz. *all the uncials* but 4, *all the cursives* but 11.

That the darkness spoken of was a divine portent--*not* an eclipse of the sun, but an incident wholly out of the course of nature--the ancients clearly recognize. Origen,[42] Julius Africanus[43] (220), Macarius Magnes[44] (330), are even eloquent on the subject. It is, nevertheless, well known that this place of S. Luke's gospel was tampered with from a very early period; and that Origen[45] (186-253), and perhaps Eusebius,[46] employed copies which had been depraved. In some copies, writes Origen, instead of 'and the sun was darkened' (καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος) is found 'the sun having become eclipsed' (τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος). He points out with truth that the thing spoken of is a physical impossibility, and delivers it as his opinion that the corruption of the text was due either to some friendly hand in order to *account for* the darkness; or else (which he,[47] and Jerome[48] after him, thought more likely)to the enemies of Revelation, who sought in this way to provide themselves with a pretext for cavil. Will it be believed that this gross fabrication--for no other reason but because it is found in ℵ B, and probably once existed in C[49]--has been resuscitated in 1881, and foisted into the sacred Text by our Revisionists?

It would be interesting to have this proceeding of theirs explained. *Why* should the truth dwell exclusively with ℵ B? It cannot be pretended that between the 4th and 5th centuries, when the copies ℵ B were made, and the 5th and 6th centuries, when copies A Q D R were executed,

this corruption of the text arose: for (as was explained at the outset) the reading in question (καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος) is found in all the oldest and most famous documents. Our Revisionists cannot advance the claim of 'clearly preponderating evidence;' for they have but fifteen manuscripts to appeal to, out of perhaps sixty times that number. They cannot pretend that essential probability is in favour of the reading of ℵ B; seeing that the thing stated is astronomically impossible. They will not tell us that critical opinion is with them: for their judgment is opposed to that of every Critic, ancient and modern, except Tischendorf since his discovery of codex ℵ. Of what nature then will be their proof? . . *Nothing* results from the discovery that ℵ reads τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος, B ἐκλείποντος,--except that those two codices are of the same corrupt type as those which Origen deliberately condemned 1650 years ago. In the meantime, with more of ingenuity than of ingenuousness, our Revisionists have attempted to conceal the foolishness of the text of their choice by translating it unfairly. They present us with, '*the sun's light failing*.' But this is a gloss of their own. There is no mention of 'the sun's *light*' in the Greek. Nor perhaps, if the rationale of the original expression were accurately ascertained, would such a paraphrase of it prove correct.[50] But, in fact, the phrase ἔκλειψις ἡλίου means 'an eclipse of the sun,' and *no other thing*. In like manner, τοῦ ἡλίον ἐκλίποντος[51] (as our Revisionists are perfectly well aware) means '*the sun becoming eclipsed*,' or '*suffering eclipse*.' And they ought either to have had the manliness to render the words faithfully, or else the good sense to let the Greek alone,--which they are respectfully assured would have been their only proper course. Καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος is, in fact, above suspicion. Τοῦ ἡλίον ἐκλείποντος, which these

learned men (with the best intentions) have put in its place, is, to speak plainly, a transparent fabrication.

(II.) The first three Evangelists are careful to note 'the *loud* cry' with which the Redeemer of the world expired. But is was reserved for S. Mark (as Chrysostom pointed out long since) to record the memorable circumstance that *this particular portent* it was, which wrought conviction, in the soul of the Roman soldier whose office it was to be present on this terrible occasion. The man had often witnessed death by crucifixion, and must have been well acquainted with its ordinary phenomena. Never before had he witnessed anything like this. He was stationed where he could see and hear all that happened: 'standing' (S. Mark says) 'near' our SAVIOUR,--'*over against Him*.' 'Now, when the centurion saw that it was *after so crying out* (κράξας). that He expired' (xv. 39), he uttered the memorable words, 'Truly this man *was* the SON of GOD'! 'What chiefly moved him to make that confession of his faith was that our SAVIOUR evidently died *with power*.'[52] But all this is lost in ℵ B L, which literally *stand alone*[53] in leaving out the central and only important word κράξας. Calamitous to relate, they are followed herein by our Revisionists: who (misled by Dr. Hort) invite us henceforth to read, 'Now when the centurion saw *that He so gave up the ghost*.'

By codex B (compared with the received text), no less than 2877 words are omitted in the four Gospels alone: by codex ℵ,--3455 words: by codex D,--3704 words.[54]

As interesting a set of instances of this, as are to be anywhere met with, occurs within the compass of the last three chapters of S. Luke's Gospel, from which about 200 words have been either forcibly ejected by our

Revisionists, or else served with a 'notice to quit.' We proceed to specify the chief of these:--

(1) S. Luke xxii. 19, 20. (Account of the Institution of the Sacrament of the LORD's Supper,--from "which is given for you" to the end,--32 words.)
(2) *ib.* 43, 44. (The Agony in the garden,--26 words.)
(3) xxiii. 17. (The custom of releasing one at the Passover,--8.)
(4) *ib.* 34. (Our LORD's prayer for His murderers,--12 words.)
(5) *ib.* 38. (The record that the title on the Cross was written in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew,--7 words.)
(6) xxiv. 1. ("and certain with them,"--4 words.)
(7) *ib.* 3. ("of the LORD JESUS,"--3 words.)
(8) *ib.* 6. ("He is not here, but He is risen,"--5 words.)
(9) *ib.* 9. ("from the sepulchre,"--3 words.)
(10) *ib.* 12. (S. Peter's visit to the sepulchre,--22 words.)
(11) *ib.* 36. ("And saith unto them, Peace be with you!"--5.)
(12) *ib.* 40. ("and when He had thus spoken, He showed them His hands and His feet,"--10 words.)
(13) *ib.* 42. ("and of an honeycomb,"--4 words.)
(14) *ib.* 51. ("and was carried up into Heaven,"--5 words.)
(15) *ib.* 52. ("worshipped Him,"--2 words.)
(16) *ib.* 53. ("praising and,"--2 words.)

The *sole* authority for just half of the places above enumerated[55] is *one Greek codex*,--and that the most depraved of all,--viz. Beza's D. It should further be stated

that the only allies discoverable for D are a few copies of the old Latin. What we are saying will seem scarcely credible: but it is a plain fact, of which all may convince themselves who will be at the pains to inspect the critical apparatus at the foot of the pages of Tischendorf's last (8th) edition, Our Revisionist's notion, therefore, of what constitutes 'weighty evidence' is now before the reader. If in his judgment the testimony of *one single manuscript*, (and *that* manuscript the Codex Beza (D).)--does really invalidate in the slightest degree that of *all other manuscripts and all other Versions* in the world,--then of course, the Greek Text of the Revisionists will in his judgment be a thing to be rejoiced over. But what if he should be of opinion that such testimony, in and by itself, is simply worthless? We shrewdly suspect that the Revisionists' view of what constitutes 'evidence' will be found to end where it began, viz. in the Jerusalem Chamber.

(4) Next in importance after the preceding, comes the prayer which the SAVIOUR of the World breathed from the Cross on behalf of His murderers (S. Luke xxiii. 34). These twelve precious words,--('Then said JESUS, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do,')--like those twenty-six in verses 43, 44 we have been considering already, Drs. Westcott and Hort enclose within double brackets, in token of the 'moral certainty' they entertain that the words are spurious.[56] And yet those words are found in *every known uncial* and in *every known cursive copy*, except four; besides being found *in every ancient Version*. And *what* (we ask the question with sincere simplicity),--*what* amount of evidence is calculated to inspire undoubting confidence in any given reading, if not such a concurrence of authorities as this? We forbear to insist upon the probabilities of the case. The Divine

power and sweetness of the incident shall not be enlarged upon. We introduce no considerations resulting from internal evidence. Let this verse of Scripture stand or fall as it meets with sufficient external testimony, or is clearly forsaken thereby. How then about the *Patristic* evidence,--for this is all that remains unexplored? Only a fraction of it was known to Tischendorf. We find our SAVIOUR'S prayer attested in the 2nd century by Hegesippus[57] and Irenæus:[58]--in the 3rd, by Origen,[59] by the Apostolic Constitutions,[60] by the Clementine Homilies,[61] and by the disputation of Archelaus with Manes:[62]--in the 4th, by Eusebius,[63] by Athanasius,[64] by Gregory Nyss.,[65] by Theodorus Herac.,[66] by Basil,[67] by Chrysostom,[68] by Ephraem Syr.,[69] by ps.-Dionysius Areop.,[70] by the Apocryphal 'Acta Pilati,'[71] by the 'Acta Philippi,'[72] and by the Syriac 'Act of the App.,'[73] by ps.-Ignatius[74] and ps.-Justin:[75]--in the 5th, by Theodoret,[76] by Cyril,[77] by Eutherius:[78]--in the 6th, by Anastasius Sin,[79] and by Hesychius:[80]--in the 7th, by Antiochus mon.,[81] by Maximus,[82] by Andreas Cret.:[83]--in the 8th, by Damascene,[84] besides ps.-Chrysostom,[85] ps.-Amphilochius,[86] and the Opus imperf.[87] Add to these (since Latin authorities have been brought to the front), Ambrose,[88] Jerome,[89] Augustine,[90] and other earlier writers.[91] And now we ask, as we asked before, with what show of reason is the brand of suspiciousness set upon these 12 words? Gravely to cite, as if there were anything in it, such counter-evidence as the following to the foregoing torrent of testimony from every part of ancient Christendom:--'B D, 38, 435, a b d and one Egyptian version'--is hardly intelligible. How could our Revisionists insinuate doubts into wavering hearts and unlearned heads, where (as here) they were *bound* to know, that there exists *no doubt at all*?

(5) The record of the same Evangelist (S. Lu. xxiii. 38) that the inscription over our SAVIOUR's Cross was 'written . . . in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew,' *disappears entirely* from our 'Revised' version; and this, for no other reason but because the incident is not recognized by B C L, the corrupt Egyptian versions, and Cureton's depraved Syriac. But surely the negative testimony of this little band of suspicious witnesses is entirely outweighed by the positive testimony of ℵ A D Q P. with 13 other uncials,--the witness of *the entire body of the cursives*,--the sanction of the Latin, Syriac, Armenian, and Æthiopic versions; besides Eusebius--whose testimony (which is express) has been hitherto strangely overlooked,[92]--and Cyril.[93] Against the threefold plea of Antiquity. Respectability of witnesses, Universality of testimony,--what have our Revisionists to show? They cannot pretend that there has been Assimilation here; for the type of S. John xix. 20 is essentially different, and has retained its distinctive character all down the ages. Nor can they pretend that the condition of the text hereabouts bears traces of having been jealously guarded. We ask the reader's attention to this matter just for a moment. There may be some of the occupants of the Jerusalem Chamber even, to whom what we are about to offer may not be altogether without the grace of novelty.

That the title on the Cross is diversely set down by each of the four Evangelists, all are aware. But perhaps all are not aware that S. Luke's exhibition of the title (in ch. xxiii. 38) is exhibited *in four different ways* by codices A B C D:--

A exhibits OYTOC ECTIN O BACIΛEYC TωN IOϒΔAIωN

B (with ℵ L and a) exhibits O BACIΛEYC TωN IOYΔAIωN OYTOC

C exhibits O BACIΛEYC TωN IOYΔAIωN (which is Mk. xv. 26).

D (with e and ff^2) exhibits O BACIΛEYC TωN IOYΔAIωN OYTOC ECTIN (which is the words of the Evangelists transposed).

We propose to recur to the foregoing specimens of licentiousness by-and-by. For the moment, let it be added that codex X and the Sahidic version conspire in a fifth variety, viz., OYTOC ECTIN IHCOYC O BACIΛEYC TωN IOYΔAIωN (which is S. Matt. xxvii. 37); while Ambrose[94] is found to have used a Latin copy which represented IHCOYC O NAZωPAIOC O BACIΛEYC TωN IOYΔAIωN (which is S. John xix. 18). We spare the reader any remarks of our own on this. He is competent to draw his own painful inferences, and will not fail to make his own damaging reflections. He shall only be further informed that 14 uncials and the whole body of the cursive copies side with codex A in upholding the Textus receptus; that the Vulgate,[95] the Peschito, Cureton's Syriac, the Philoxenian,--besides the Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions--are all on the same side; lastly, that Origen,[96] Eusebius, and Gregory of Nyssa[97] are in addition consentient witnesses;--and we can hardly be mistaken if we venture to anticipate (1st), that the reader will agree with us that the Text with which we are all best acquainted (as usual) is here deserving of our confidence; and (2ndly), that the Revisionists who assure us 'that they did not esteem it within their province to construct a continuous and complete Greek Text;' (and who were never instructed to construct a *new Greek Text at all*;) are not justified in the course they have pursued with regard to S. Luke xxiii. 38. 'THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS' is the only idiomatic way of rendering into English the title according to S. Luke, whether the reading of A or of B be adopted; but, in order to make it plain that they *reject the Greek of* A *in favour of* B, the Revisionists have gone out of their way. They have instructed the Editors of 'The Greek

Testament with the readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version' to exhibits S. Luke xxiii. 38 *as it stands in the mutilated recension of Drs. Westcott and Hort.*[98] And if *this*, repeated hundreds of times, be not constructing 'a new Greek Text' of the N.T., we have yet to learn what *is*.

(10) We find it impossible to pass by in silence the treatment which S. Luke xxiv. 12 has experienced at their hands. They have branded with doubt S. Luke's memorable account of S. Peter's visit to the sepulchre. And why? Let the evidence *for* this precious portion of narrative be first rehearsed. Nineteen uncials then, with ℵ A B at their head, supported by *every known cursive* copy,--all these vouch for the genuineness of the verse in question. The Latin, the Syriac, and the Egyptian versions also contain it. Eusebius,[99] Gregory of Nyssa,[100] Cyril,[101] Severus,[102] Ammonius,[103] and others[104] refer to it: while *no ancient writer* is found to impugn it. Then, *why* the double brackets of Westcott and Hort? and *why* the correlative marginal note of our Revisionists? Simply, because 'D and 5 copies of the old Latin (a b e l f u) leave these 22 words out.

(11) On the same sorry evidence--(viz. D and 5 copies of the old Latin)--it is proposed henceforth to omit our SAVIOUR'S greeting to His disciples when He appeared among them in the upper chamber on the evening of the first Easter Day. And yet the precious words are vouched for by 18 uncials (with ℵ A B at their head), and *every known cursive copy* of the Gospels; by all the Versions; and (as before) by Eusebius[105] and Ambrose,[106] by Chrysostom[107] and Cyril[108] and Augustine.[109]

(12) The same remarks suggest themselves on a survey of the evidence for S. Luke xxiv. 40:--'And when He had thus spoken, He shewed them His hands and His

feet.' The words are found in 18 uncials (beginning with ℵ A B), and in every known cursive: in the Latin,[110] the Syriac, the Egyptian,--in short, in *all* the ancient Versions. Besides these, ps.-Justin,[111] Eusebius,[112] Athanasius,[113] Ambrose (in Greek),[114] Epiphanius,[115] Chrysostom,[116] Cyril,[117] Theodoret,[118] Ammonius,[119] and J. Damascene[120] quote them. What but the veriest trifling is it, in the face of such a body of evidence, to bring forward the fact that D and 5 copies of the old Latin with Cureton's Syriac *omit* the words in question?

To attempt, as they have done, to build the Text of the New Testament on a tissue of unproved assertions and the eccentricities of a single codex of bad character, is about as hopeful a proceeding as would be the attempt to erect an Eddystone lighthouse on the Goodwin Sands.

End Notes

1. Scrivener's 'Introd.' p. 118.

2. Bishop Ellicott's 'Considerations on Revision,' &c. (1870), p. 40.

3. The word is used to describe manuscripts written in 'running-hand,' of which the oldest are considered to belong to the 9th century.

4. Scrivener's 'Introduction,' p. 342-4. We prefer to quote the indictment from the pages of one of the Revisionists.

5. 'Ex scriptoribus Græcis *tantisper Origene* solo usi sumus.' --*Præfatio*, p.xxi.

6. Scrivener's 'Introd.' p. 472.

7. Ibid. (ed. 1874), p. 429.

8. Ibid. p. 470.

9. Ibid.

10. From the Preface prefixed to the 'limited and private issue' of 1870, p. vi.

11. Ibid. p. xv.

12. Ibid. p. xviii.

13. Ibid. p. xvi.

14. From the Preface prefixed to the 'limited and private issue' of 1870, pp. xviii., xix.

15. While these sheets are passing through the press, a copy of the long-expected volume reaches us. The theory of the respected authors proves to be the simplest imaginable, and is briefly *this*:--Fastening on the two oldest codices extant (B and ℵ, both of the 4th century), they invent the following hypothesis:--'That the ancestries of those two manuscripts *diverged from a point near the autographs, and never came into contact subsequently*.'

Having thus secured two independent witnesses of what was in the sacred autographs, the Editors claim that *the coincidence* of ℵ and B must 'mark those portions of text in which two primitive and entirely separate lines of transmission had not come to differ from each other through independent corruption:' and therefore that, 'in the absence of specially strong internal evidence to the contrary, the readings of ℵ and B combined *may safely be accepted as genuine*.'

What is to be done, however, when the same two codices diverge *one from the other*? In all such cases (we are assured) the readings of any 'binary combination' of B are to be preferred, because, 'on the closest scrutiny,' they generally 'have *the ring of genuineness*;' hardly ever '*look suspicious* after full consideration.' 'Even when B stands *quite alone*, its readings must never be lightly rejected.'

But we decline to admit that the texts exhibited by B ℵ can have 'diverged from a point near the sacred autographs, and never come into contact subsequently.' We are able to show, on the contrary, that the readings they jointly embody afford the strongest presumption that the MSS. which contain them are nothing else but specimens of those 'corrected,' i.e. *corrupted* copies, which are known to have abounded in the earliest ages of the Church. From the prevalence of identical depravations in either, we infer that they are, on the

contrary, derived from some not very remote corrupt common ancestor: and therefore, that their coincidence, when they differ from all (or nearly all) other MSS., so far from marking 'two primitive and entirely separate lines of transmission' of the inspired autographs, does but mark what was derived from the same corrupt common ancestor: whereby the supposed two independent witnesses to the Evangelic verity become resolved into *a single witness to a fabricated text of the 3rd century.*

It is impossible in the meantime to withhold from these learned and excellent men (who are infinitely better than their theory) the tribute of our sympathy and concern at the evident perplexity and constant distress to which their own fatal major premiss has reduced them. The Nemesis of Superstition and Idolatry is ever the same. Doubt,--unbelief,--credulity,--general mistrust of *all* evidence, is the inevitable sequel and penalty. In 1870, Drs. Westcott and Hort solemnly assured their brother Revisionists that 'the prevalent assumption, that throughout the N.T. the true text is to be found *somewhere* among recorded readings, *does not stand the test of experience*: [P. xxi.] and they are evidently still haunted by the same spectral suspicion. They see a ghost to be exorcised in every dark corner. 'The Art of *Conjectural Emendation*; (says Dr. Hort) 'depends for its success so much on personal endowments, fertility of resource in the first instance, and even more an appreciation of language too delicate to acquiesce in merely plausible corrections, that it is easy to forget its true character as a critical operation founded on knowledge and method.'[*Introd.* p.71.] Specimens of the writer's skill in this department abound. *One* occurs at p. 135 (*App.*) where, *in defiance of every known document*, he evacuates S. Paul's memorable injunction to Timothy (2 Tim. 1:13) of all its significance. May we be allowed to assure its significance. May we be

allowed to assure him that IN BIBLICAL TEXTUAL CRITICISM 'CONJECTURAL EMENDATION' HAS NO PLACE?

16. Scrivener, 'Introduction,' p. 453.

17. προσέφερον αὐτῷ,--S. Matt. ix. 2.

21. Scrivener, 'Introd.' p. 472

22. The words omitted are therefore the following 22: ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν ἰοῖς οὐρανοῖς . . . γενηθήτηω τὸ Θέλημά σον, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπί τῆς γῆς. . . ἀλλὰ ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

23. 'Companion to the Revised Version.' D. 61.

24. Pp. 334, published by Parker, Oxford 1871

25. As Dr. Jacobson and Dr. Chr. Wordsworth,-- the learned Bishops of Chester and Lincoln

26. 'Lectures on Bible Revision,' pp. 119-20.

27. ' Words of the N. T.' p. 193

28. ' Companion to the Revised Version,' p. 63

29. Ibid. p. 62

30. Viz. Eusebius, Macarius Magnes, Aphraates, Didymus, the Syriac 'Acts of the App.,' Epiphanius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine. For the disputation of Marcarius Magnes (A.D. 300-350) with a heathen philosopher, which has recently come to light contains an elaborate discussion of S. Mark xvi. 17, 18.

31. But then, note that c is only available for comparison down to the end of ver. 5. In the 9 verses which have been lost, who shall say how many more eccentricities would have been discoverable?

32. Exod. x. 21-23.

33. S. Matth. xxvii. 45; S. Mark xv. 33; S. Lu. xxiii. 44.

34. Ap. Epiphan. i. 347

35. 'Sol media die *tenebricavit*.' Tertull. *adv. Jud.* c. xiii.

36. Ap. Routh, 'Opusc.' i. 79.

37. i. 90, 913; ap. Epiph. i. 1006

38. *Syr.* ii. 48.

39. i. 305

40. Ap. Mai. ii. 436; iii. 395.

41. i. 288, 417.

42. iii. 922-4. Read the whole of cap. 134. See also ap. Galland. xiv. 82, append., which by the way deserves to be compared with Chrys.

43. ἀλλ᾽ ἦν σκότος Θεοποίητον, διότι τὸν κύριον συνέβη παΘεῖν.-- Routh, ii. 298.

44. εἶτ᾽ ἐξαίφνης κατενεχΘὲν ψηλαφητὸν σκότος ἡλίον τὴν οἰκείαν αὐγὴν ἀποκρύψαντος, p.29.

45. i. 414, 415; iii. 56

46. Ap. Mai, iv. 296. But further on he says: αὐτίκα γοῦν ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει οὐχ ἥλιος μόνον ἐσκότασεν κ.τ.λ. Cyril of Jerusalem (pp. 57, 146, 199, 201, 202) and Cosmas (ap. Montif. ii. 177) were apparently acquainted with the same reading, but neither of them actually quotes Luke xxiii. 43.

47. 'In quibusdam exemplaribus non habetur *tenebræ factæ sunt, et obscuratus est sol*: sed ita *tenebræ factæ sunt super omnem terram. sole deficiente*. Et forsitan auaua est aliquis quasi manifestius aliquid dicere volens, pro, *ot obscuratus est sol*, ponere *Deficiente sole*, existimans quod non aliter potuissent fieri tenebræ, nisi sole deficiente. Puto autem magis quod insidiatores ecciesiæ Christi mutaverunt hoc verbum, quoniam *tenebræ factæ sunt sole deficiente*, ut verisimiliter evangelia argui possint secundum adinventiones volentium arguere illa.' (iii. 923 f.a).

48. vii. 235.

49. This rests on little more than conjecture. Tisch. 'Cod. Ephr. Syr.Ξ p. 327.

50. Our old friend of Halicarnassus (vii. 37), speaking of an eclipse which happened B.C. 481, remarks: ὁ ἥλιος ἐκλιπὼν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδρην.

51. For it will be perceived that our Revisionists have adopted the reading vouched for *only by codex* B. What C* once read is as uncertain (for it has been erased) as it is unimportant.

52. Chrysostom, vii. 825.

53. The Coptic represents ὅτι ἐξέπνευσε.

54. But then, 25 (out of 320) pages of D are lost: D's omission in the Gospels may therefore be estimated at 4000. Codex A does not admit of comparison, the first 24 chapters of S. Matthew having perished; but, from examining the way it exhibits the other three Gospels, it is found that 650 would about represent the number of words omitted from its text.

55. Viz. the 1st, the 7th to 12th inclusive, and the 15th.

56. The editors shall speak for themselves concerning this, the first of the 'Seven last Words:'--'We cannot doubt that *it comes from an extraneous source*:' 'need not have belonged originally *to the book in which it is now included*:' is '*a Western interpolation*.'

57. Ap. Eus.

58. P. 521.

59. ii. 188.

60. Ap. Gall. iii. 38, 127.

61. Ib. ii. 714.

62. Ap. Routh, v. 161.

63. He places the verses in Can. x.

64. i. 1120.

65. iii. 289.

66. Cat. in Ps. iii. 219.

67. i. 290.

68. 15 times.

69. ii. 48, 321, 428; ii. (*syr.*) 233.

70. i. 607.

71. Pp. 232, 286.

72. P. 85.

73. Pp. 11, 16. Dr. Wright assigns them to the fourth century.

74. Eph. c.x.

75. ii. 166, 168, 226.

76. Six. times.

77. Ap. Mai, ii. 197; iii. 392.

78. Ap. Theod. v. 1152.

79. Pp. 423, 457.

80. Cat. in Ps. i. 768; ii. 663.

81. Pp. 1109, 1134.

82. i. 374.

83. P. 93.

84. ii. 67, 747.

85. i. 814; ii. 819, v. 735.

86. P. 88.

87. Ap. Chrys. vi. 191.

88. 11 times.

89. 12 times.

90. More than 60 times.

91. Ap. Cypr. (ed. Baluze), &c. &c.

92. Eclog. Proph. p. 89.

93. In Luc. 435 and 718.

94. i. 1528.

95. So Sedulius Paschalis, ap. Galland. ix. 595.

96. iii. 2.

97. Euseb. 'Ecl. Proph.' p. 89: Greg. Nyss. i. 570.--These last two places have hitherto escaped observation

98. Viz., thus:--ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος.

99. Ap. Mai, iv. 287, 293

100. i. 364.

101. Ap. Mai, ii. 439.

102. Ap. Galland. xi. 224.

103. Cat. in Joann. p. 453.

104. Ps.-Chrys. viii. 161-2. Johannes Thessal. ap. Galland. xiii. 189.

105. Ap. Mai, iv. 293 *bis;* 294 *diserte.*

106. i. 506, 1541.

107. iii. 91.

108. iv. 1108, and Luc. 728 (=Mai. ii. 441).

109. iii^2. 142; viii. 472.

110. So Tertullian:--'*Manus et pedes suos inspiciendos offert*' (Carn. c. 5). '*Inspectui corum manus et pedes suos offert*' (Marc. iv. c. 43). Also Jerome i. 712.

111. 'De Resur.' 240 (quoted by J. Damascene, ii. 762).

112. Ap. Mai. iv. 294.

113. i. 906, quoted by Epiph. i. 1003.

114. Ap. Theodoret, iv. 141.

115. i. 49.

116. i. 510; ii. 408, 418; iii. 91.

117. iv. 1108; vi. 23 (Trin.). Ap. Mai, ii. 442 *ter.*

118. iv. 272.

119. Cat. in Joan. 462, 3.

120. i. 303.

Summary

SUMMARY

The Lord gave the New Testament during the first century. The New Testament canon was collected and carefully preserved by the Apostle John until his death around 100 A.D.

The New Testament priesthood of believers carefully guarded this sacred trust. Under the direction of the Holy Spirit, many thousands of copies were made.

Throughout the dark ages true believers had copies of the sacred text, even though Satan tried to destroy the Word of God.

The great scholars, institutional heads, and heads of state all recognized Erasmus in 1516 as the scholar with the greatest intellect of his time. God prepared and chose Erasmus to place the sacred text in print in 1516, just one year before the Reformation. From the existing manuscripts, he chose the best and a Greek text came into existence that was used by the reformers to translate Bibles into languages of the people.

This text was used for the Tyndale Bible and the King James in 1611.

In 1881, Satan CLEVERLY SUCCEEDED IN DIVERTING MOST PROTESTANT INTELLECTUAL THEOLOGIANS to a corrupt Greek text, the Westcott and Hort. This text is the basis for most of the modern versions. It is based primarily on just one very corrupt manuscript, the Vaticanus, a manuscript that the priesthood of believers rejected throughout the centuries.

The **Authorized King James Version of 1611** still stands as the best English Bible of all time.

How You Can Better Understand Your King James Bible of 1611

You might ask, "How can I understand my King James Bible better?" There are two ways; first, spend time in the prayer closet in order to prepare your heart to understand His Word. The Holy Spirit wrote the Word and He is a great teacher of the Word.[1] Second, get a good English dictionary. The King James translators translated accurately from the original languages, preserving the original meaning. A good English dictionary is all you need.

Since there has existed no one, since the King James' translators, who is as qualified as they to translate the Greek and Hebrew, and since it takes many years of study to be able to understand the true meaning of the Greek and Hebrew, it would be better for most Christians to depend upon the accurate translation of the King James with the assistance of a good unabridged English dictionary.

---

[1] 1 John 2:27- But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aland, Kurt. *The Greek New Testament: Its present and Future Editions.*

Anderson, Sir Robert. *The Bible and Modern Criticism.*

Brown, Terence H. *The Learned Man.*

Burgon, John W. and E. Miller. *The Causes of the Corruptions of the Traditional Text of the Holy Scriptures.*

Burgon, John W. *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to St. Mark.*

Burgon, John W. *The London Quarterly Review. October, 1881.*

Burgon, John W. *The Revision Revised.*

Cook. *Revised Version.*

Core. *New Commentary.*

Ellicott. *Addresses.*

Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History, Book 5.*

Gregory. *The Canon and Text of the New Testament.*

Hemphill, Samuel. *History of the Revised Version.*

Hills, Edward F. *The King James Version Defended.*

Hodges, Zane. *The Greek Text of the King James Version.*

Hort, F.J.A. *Introduction to the Revised Version. Life of Hort, Vol.2.*

Hoskier, H.C. *Codex B and its Allies, Vol. 1.*

Hoskier, H.C. *Genesis of the Versions. Iraneus Against Heresies, Book 3.*

Kenyon, F.G. *Criticism of the New Testament, St. Margaret's Lectures.*

Kenyon, F.G. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts.*

Kenyon, F.G. *Recent Developments.*

Kenyon, F.G. *Recent Discoveries.*

Kenyon, F.G. *Text of the Greek Bible.*

Letis, Theodore P., ed., *The Majority Text: Essays and Reviews in the Continuing Debate (Grand Rapids: The Institute for Biblical Textual Studies,1987).*

Miller, H.S. *General Biblical Introduction.*
Price, Ira M. *The Ancestry of the English Bible.*
Salmon. *Some Criticism.*
Schaff, Phillip. *Companion to Greek Testament.*
Schrivener,F.H.A. *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T. Vol. 1.*
Smith, Miles. *The Translators to the Reader.*
Streeter. *The Four Gospels, 1930. Life of Westcott, Vol.1.*
Wilson, Robert Dick. *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?*